arXiv:1704.06686v1 [math.SG] 21 Apr 2017

# Integrable systems, symmetries, and quantization

Daniele Sepe* Vũ Ngọc San†

April 25, 2017

**Keywords :** classical and quantum integrable systems, moment(um) maps, spectral theory, quantization.
**MS Classification:** 37J35, 53D05, 70H06, 81Q20.

**Abstract**

These notes correspond to a mini-course given at the Poisson 2016 conference in Geneva. Starting from classical integrable systems in the sense of Liouville, we explore the notion of non-degenerate singularity and expose recent research in connection with semi-toric systems. The quantum and semiclassical counterpart will also be presented, in the viewpoint of the inverse question: from the quantum mechanical spectrum, can you recover the classical system?

## 1 Foreword

These notes, after a general introduction, is split into four parts:

1. Integrable systems and action-angle coordinates (Section 3), where the basic notions about Liouville integrable systems are recalled;

2. Almost-toric singular fibers (Section 4), where emphasis is laid on a Morse-like theory of integrable systems;

3. Semi-toric systems (Section 5), where we introduce the recent semi-toric systems and their classification;

*Universidade Federal Fluminense, Instituto de Matemática, Campus do Valonguinho CEP 24020-140, Niterói (Brazil), email: danielesepe@id.uff.br
†IRMAR (UMR 6625), Université de Rennes 1, Campus de Beaulieu, 35042 Rennes cedex (France), email: san.vu-ngoc@univ-rennes1.fr

4. Quantum systems and the inverse problem (Section 6); where the geometric study is applied to the world of quantum mechanics.

The main objective is to serve as an introduction to recent research in the field of classical and quantum integrable systems, in particular in the relatively new and expanding theory of semi-toric systems, in which the authors have taken an active part in the last ten years, see [73, 57, 58, 33] and references therein.

We are also very glad to propose, for the tireless reader, a link to some exercises that have been given during this Summer School for this lecture, by Yohann Le Floch and Joseph Palmer, to whom we want to express our gratitude for their excellent work; see [43].

# 2 Introduction

## 2.1 Classical mechanics

One of the main motivations for studying integrable Hamiltonian systems is classical mechanics. Recall Newton's equation, for the position $q \in \mathbb{R}^n$ of a particle of mass $m$ under the action of a force $\vec{F}(q)$:

$$m\ddot{q} = \vec{F}(q) \tag{1}$$

This ordinary differential equation can be easily solved locally, either theoretically via the Cauchy-Lipschitz, or numerically, if the force $\vec{F}$ is smooth enough. However, as is well known, the behaviour for long times can be quite tricky, in the sense that the sensitivity on initial conditions can prohibit both theoretical and numerical approaches to obtaining relevant qualitative and quantitative description of the trajectories. A natural way to deal with this issue is to discover (or impose) *conserved quantities*, as these will reduce the dimensionality of the space where the trajectories will live.

A particularly useful setting for finding conserved quantities is the Hamiltonian formulation of classical mechanics. We shall assume that forces derive from a smooth potential function $V$:

$$\vec{F}(q) = -\nabla V(q).$$

Then Newton's equation becomes equivalent to the following so-called Hamiltonian system:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{q} = & \dfrac{\partial H}{\partial p} \\ \dot{p} = & -\dfrac{\partial H}{\partial q}, \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

where the *Hamiltonian* (or Hamilton function) is

$$H(q,p) = \frac{\|p\|^2}{2m} + V(q), \tag{3}$$

and the new variable $p$, called the impulsion or the *momentum*, corresponds to $m\dot{q}$ in Newton's equation. We have now a dynamical system in the space $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$ of the variables $(q,p)$, called the *phase space*. The physical dimension $n$ is usually called the *number of degrees of freedom* of the system. A fundamental feature of Hamilton's formulation is that it admits a coordinate-free presentation, where the phase space is not restricted to $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$, but can be any symplectic manifold, see Section 3.

A Hamiltonian system, in general, is a dynamical system of the form (2) for some function $H$ of phase space. Hamiltonian systems are ubiquitous in mechanics. The particular form of Equation (3) can serve to obtain the motion of a massive particle subject to gravity, or a charged particle subject to an electric field $V$. Electromagnetism can easily enter the picture: the Lorentz force $\vec{F} = e\dot{q} \wedge \vec{B}$, where $n = 3$ and $\vec{B}$ is the magnetic vector field in $\mathbb{R}^3$, also possesses a Hamiltonian formulation, as follows. Let $A(q)$ be a magnetic potential, *i.e.* $\mathrm{curl}A = \vec{B}$. Then the motion of a particle of charge $e$ in the electro-magnetic field $(V, \vec{B})$ is obtained by the Hamiltonian:

$$H(q,p) = \frac{\|p - eA(q)\|^2}{2m} + V(q),$$

Note that the Hamiltonian formulation is not limited to finite dimensional systems; many evolution PDEs have a 'formal' Hamiltonian structure, which gives important insights via conservation laws (cf. [53] and references therein for many beautiful examples).

In a Hamiltonian system, the energy is conserved along any trajectory; thus the motion is restricted to a hypersurface. Of course this is very important: a Hamiltonian system will never explore the whole phase space. However, in general one cannot say much more. The motion can very well be ergodic (which is sometimes said to be a form of 'chaotic' behaviour) in the sense that the motion will explore in a dense way the whole energy hypersurface. Geodesic flows on hyperbolic surfaces have this property.

Because of energy conservation, Hamiltonian systems of one degree of freedom ($n = 1$) become very special. Indeed, the hypersurface is (generically) a submanifold of dimension 1, *ie.* a curve: it will necessarly coincide with the trajectory itself! For such systems, the geometry of the energy levels is tightly related to the dynamics of the system. In particular, an immediate corollary of energy conservation is the following: if the hypersurface is

compact, the motion is periodic. This is very strong indeed! (For many dynamical systems, the mere question of finding a single periodic trajectory is open and can lead to formidable mathematical developments.) For a one degree of freedom Hamiltonian system, not only almost all trajectories are periodic, but we have much more: the motion is symplectically conjugated to a rotation at 'constant' speed. Caveat: the 'constant' will in general depend on the energy. This will be the content of the action-angle theorem, cf. Theorem 3.31 in Section 3.

## 2.2 Quantum mechanics

Another motivation for these lectures is quantum mechanics, as developed by Heisenberg, Dirac, Schrödinger, etc. in the 1920-1930. This 'old' quantum mechanics can still produce very intriguing results (superposition principle (Schrödinger's cat), intrication, quantum computing etc.) and is an active area of research in mathematics (or mathematical physics), not to mention recent Nobel prizes in Physics (Thouless–Haldane–Kosterlitz in 2016, Haroche–Wineland in 2012, etc.) Some of the results that we present here have been used by quantum chemists when studying the light spectrum of simple molecules (water, $CO_2$, etc., see for instance [10, 11, 18, 39, 68]).

The starting point is Schrödinger's equation, which can be written as follows:

$$-i\hbar\partial_t\psi = \hat{H}\psi, \quad \hat{H} := \frac{-\hbar^2}{2m}\Delta + V. \tag{4}$$

where the unknown is the 'wave function' $\psi \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$. The solution of this infinite dimensional dynamical system is a trajectory $t \mapsto \psi_t$ living in this Hilbert space. As you can see, this equation bears strong similarities with the old XVII$^{\text{th}}$ century Newton equation (1), and in particular its Hamiltonian formulation (2)–(3). Given a normalized initial condition $\psi_0$ at $t = 0$, it can be solved formally by the evolution group $\psi_t = e^{it\hat{H}/\hbar}\psi_0$. However the physical interpretation of $\psi_t$ remains quite mysterious, even nowadays, for several reasons. The first one is that $\psi_t$ does not provide the deterministic position of the quantum particle. It can only give a probabilistic answer : $|\psi_t(x)|^2\, dx$ is the probability measure to find the particle at time $t$ at the position $x$. The second oddity follows directly from the linearity of the equation: if one finds two solutions, their *sum* is again a solution. This cannot have anything to do with classical mechanics!

Since the coefficients of the Schrödinger evolution equation do not depend on time, a first natural step is to perform a partial Fourier transform with

respect to $t$; this amounts to searching for solutions of the form

$$\psi_t(x) = e^{i\lambda t/\hbar} u(x); \tag{5}$$

these are called 'stationary solutions', because their modulus (and hence the associated probability measure) does not change as time varies. Thus, the new time-independent wave function $u$ satisfies the stationary Schrödinger equation

$$\lambda u = \hat{H} u.$$

In other words, the initial evolution equation is transformed into a classic eigenproblem: find eigenvectors and eigenvalues of the operator $\hat{H}$. In order for this problem to be well-posed, one needs to specify the space where $u$ should live. This, both in terms of functional analysis and from the physics viewpoint, is out of the scope of these notes. Localized eigenfunctions correspond to spaces requiring a decay at infinity, most often the popular $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ space, with Lebesgue measure. On the other hand, scattering problems will typically involve 'generalized' eigenfunctions, which do not belong to the standard $L^2$ space, but can be interpreted as elements of another $L^2$ space equipped with a suitable weight rapidly decreasing at infinity. In both cases, one has to take care of the fact that the spectrum of the operator need not contain only eigenvalues; continuous spectrum can show up, and is the signature of non-localized solutions. In these notes, we only deal with cases where the quantum particule is 'confined', which leads to purely discrete spectrum: isolated eigenvalues with finite multiplicity.

The goal of the lecture will be to emphasize some interplay between Hamiltonian dynamics of the classical Hamiltonian $H$, and the structure of the discrete spectrum of the quantum Hamiltonian $\hat{H}$. In particular we are interested in the following inverse spectral problem. *Assume that one knows the spectrum of the Schrödinger operator* (or, a more general quantum operator). *Can one determine the underlying classical mechanics?*

In order to have a rigorous link between quantum and classical mechanics, one needs to introduce the so-called semiclassical limit. Following a long tradition (see the Landau-Lifshitz book [42]), we think of the noncommutative algebra of quantum operators on $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ as a deformation (in the algebraic sense) of the commutative algebra of functions on $\mathbb{R}^n$. In order to write down such a deformation, we need a formal parameter, that we call $\hbar$ in honor of the Planck constant.

As can be guessed from Equations (4) and (5), the limit $\hbar \to 0$ is highly singular. It should not be considered as a perturbation theory. Formally, letting $\hbar = 0$ in (4) kills the term $\frac{-\hbar^2}{2m}\Delta$, which is the quantum kinetic energy,

leaving only the potential $V$; however, in the correct semiclassical limit, we want to recover the full classical mechanics, *i.e.* both kinetic and potential energies must survive at leading order.

The way to understand the correct limiting procedure is to introduce *fast oscillations*, not only in time (Equation (5)), but also in space. (And indeed, the semiclassical theory applies to a wide range of problems involving high frequencies, not necessarily emanating from quantum mechanical problems.) If $u$ oscillates at a frequency proportional to $\hbar^{-1}$, then each derivative of $u$ gets multiplied by $\hbar^{-1}$, and $\frac{-\hbar^2}{2m}\Delta$ becomes of zero order, as required. We refer to [43, Exercise 5], where the basic idea of the oscillating WKB ansatz is worked out.

The inverse spectral problem that we want to solve has to be thought of in the semiclassical limit as well. This means that we are interested in recovering the geometry from the asymptotic beheviour of the spectrum as $\hbar \to 0$. In the case of non-degenerate (or Morse) Hamiltonians in one degree of freedom, a positive answer is given in [77]. Even more recently, the symplectic classification of the so-called semi-toric systems has paved to way to the solution of this 'spectral conjecture' for this class of systems. An important goal of these lectures is to present semi-toric systems.

### 2.3 Integrability

Hamiltonian systems of only one degree of freedom are 'integrable', simply because the energy $H$ is conserved along the trajectories. Thus, by a mere application of the implicit function theorem (solving $H(x, \xi) = \text{const}$), one can essentially solve the dynamical system, up to time reparameterization. Of course, the situation can be delicate at critical points of $H$, but even then, the fact that the two-dimensional phase space is foliated by the possibly singular curves $H(x, \xi) = \text{const}$ can be seen as an 'integration' of the dynamical system.

What about higher dimensions? What are the situations where one can 'geometrically integrate' the dynamics?

The first, very natural idea, is to consider systems with symmetries. Indeed, one can hope to *reduce* the symmetry and descend to a 1D system, which then is integrable. Such systems, for which this can be done, are called *integrable*. The aim of the next section is to give a precise definition, which is more general: the strength of the theory lies in the fact that one does not need a true symmetry: an *infinitesimal* symmetry is enough.

A good example of a two-degree of freedom integral system with a global symmetry is the spherical pendulum, which dates back to Huygens [36], and

was revived by Cushman and Duistermaat [17]; see also [76, Chap. 3]. Symplectic geometers who prefer compact phase spaces may be more interested by the so-called spin-orbit system, which is a coupling of two spheres $S^2$, and contains a similarly rich geometry, see [63]. Both admit a quantum version, see Section 6. Properties of the spherical pendulum are worked out in [43, Exercises 4 and 6].

# 3 Integrable systems and action-angle coordinates

## 3.1 Hamiltonian systems on symplectic manifolds

Throughout this section, fix a $2n$-dimensional symplectic manifold $(M, \omega)$. Non-degeneracy of $\omega$ implies that, associated to any $f \in C^\infty(M)$, there is a unique vector field $\mathcal{X}_f \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ defined by

$$\omega(\mathcal{X}_f, \cdot) = -\mathrm{d}f.$$

**Definition 3.1.** *Given any $f \in C^\infty(M)$, the vector field $\mathcal{X}_f$ is called the* Hamiltonian vector field *associated to $f$, while its flow is the* Hamiltonian flow *of $f$.*

Hamiltonian vector fields and their flows are symmetries of symplectic manifolds.

**Lemma 3.2.** *For any $f \in C^\infty(M)$, $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{X}_f}\omega = 0$, i.e. $\mathcal{X}_f$ is an infinitesimal symmetry of $(M, \omega)$.*

*Proof.* Using Cartan's formula, obtain that

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{X}_f}\omega = \iota_{\mathcal{X}_f}\mathrm{d}\omega + \mathrm{d}(\iota_{\mathcal{X}_f}\omega) = 0 + \mathrm{d}(-\mathrm{d}f) = 0.$$

□

**Example 3.3.** Recall that any symplectic manifold admits local Darboux coordinates, *i.e.* for any $p \in M$, there exists an open neighborhood $U \subset M$ of $p$ and a coordinate chart $\varphi : (V, \omega_{\mathrm{can}}) \to (U, \omega)$, where $V \subset \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ is an open neighbourhood of the origin and

$$\omega_{\mathrm{can}} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathrm{d}\xi_i \wedge \mathrm{d}x_i =: \mathrm{d}\xi \wedge \mathrm{d}x,$$

such that $\varphi^*\omega = \omega_{\mathrm{can}}$ (cf. [47, Theorem 3.15]). In these coordinates, it is instructive to calculate $\mathcal{X}_{x_j}$ and $\mathcal{X}_{\xi_j}$. For instance, if $v \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$, comparing

$$\omega(\mathcal{X}_{\xi_j}, v) = (\mathrm{d}\xi \wedge \mathrm{d}x)(\mathcal{X}_{\xi_j}, v) = \langle \mathrm{d}\xi(\mathcal{X}_{\xi_j}), \mathrm{d}x(v)\rangle - \langle \mathrm{d}\xi(v), \mathrm{d}x(\mathcal{X}_{\xi_j})\rangle$$

and

$$\omega(\mathcal{X}_{\xi_j}, v) = -d\xi_j(v),$$

we see that, for all $i$, $\mathrm{d}\xi_i(\mathcal{X}_{\xi_j}) = 0$ and $\mathrm{d}x_i(\mathcal{X}_{\xi_j}) = \delta^i_j$. Therefore $\mathcal{X}_{\xi_j} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}$. Similarly, $\mathcal{X}_{x_j} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial \xi_j}$.

The symplectic form $\omega$ endows $C^\infty(M)$ with the following algebraic structure, which is, in some sense, compatible with the underlying smooth structure.

**Definition 3.4.** *The* Poisson bracket *induced by $\omega$ on $C^\infty(M)$ is the $\mathbb{R}$-bilinear, skew-symmetric bracket $\{\cdot,\cdot\} : C^\infty(M) \times C^\infty(M) \to C^\infty(M)$ defined as*

$$\{f, g\} = \omega(\mathcal{X}_f, \mathcal{X}_g),$$

*for any $f, g \in C^\infty(M)$.*

The following lemma, whose proof is left as an exercise to the reader (cf. [47, Section 3]), illustrates some fundamental properties of the above Poisson bracket.

**Lemma 3.5.**

- *The Poisson bracket $\{\cdot,\cdot\}$ makes $C^\infty(M)$ into a Lie algebra, called the algebra of* classical observables *or* Hamiltonians*;*
- *The Poisson bracket $\{\cdot,\cdot\}$ satisfies* the Leibniz identity*, i.e. for all $f, g, h \in C^\infty(M)$,*

$$\{f, gh\} = g\{f, h\} + \{f, g\}h;$$

- *For any $f, g \in C^\infty(M)$ and any (possibly locally defined) smooth map $\chi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, the Poisson bracket $\{\cdot,\cdot\}$ satisfies*

$$\{f, \chi(g)\} = \{f, g\}\chi'(g);$$

- *The map*

$$\begin{aligned}(C^\infty(M), \{\cdot,\cdot\}) &\to (\mathfrak{X}, [\cdot,\cdot]) \\ f &\mapsto \mathcal{X}_f,\end{aligned}$$

  *where $[\cdot,\cdot]$ denotes the standard Lie bracket on vector fields, is a Lie algebra homomorphism.*

Poisson brackets arose naturally in the study of Hamiltonian mechanics (cf. [78] and references therein); to this end, it is worthwhile mentioning that, for any $f \in C^\infty(M)$, $\mathcal{X}_f$, as a derivation, is just the Poisson bracket by $f$; in other words the evolution of a function $g$ under the flow of $\mathcal{X}_f$ is given by the equation

$$\dot{g} = \{f, g\}.$$

Indeed, $\{f, g\} = \omega(\mathcal{X}_f, \mathcal{X}_g) = \mathrm{d}g(\mathcal{X}_f)$.

**Example 3.6.** In local Darboux coordinates $(x, \xi)$ (cf. Example 3.3), it can be shown that, for all $i, j = 1, \ldots, n$, $\{\xi_i, x_j\} = \delta_{ij}$, $\{\xi_i, \xi_j\} = 0 = \{x_i, x_j\}$. Thus, for any $f, g \in C^\infty(M)$, locally the Poisson bracket equals

$$\{f, g\} = \mathrm{d}g(\mathcal{X}_f) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial \xi_i} \frac{\partial g}{\partial x_i} - \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i} \frac{\partial g}{\partial \xi_i} \right).$$

**Remark 3.7.** Definitions 3.1 and 3.4 only depend on the symplectic structure and hence must behave naturally with respect to symplectomorphisms. For instance $\{f, g\} \circ \varphi = \{f \circ \varphi, g \circ \varphi\}$ if $\varphi : (M, \omega) \to (M, \omega)$ is a symplectomorphism (and this can even be taken as a characterisation of symplectomorphisms). Therefore, the Hamiltonian flow of $\varphi^* f = f \circ \varphi$ is mapped by $\varphi$ to the Hamiltonian flow of $f$. In fact the naturality of the definitions yields, for any symplectomorphism $\varphi$,

$$\mathcal{X}_{\varphi^* f} = \varphi^* \mathcal{X}_f := d\varphi^{-1} \mathcal{X}_f \circ \varphi.$$

△

## 3.2 Integrals of motion and Liouville integrability

In the Hamiltonian formulation of classical mechanics, one of the most general problems is to study the dynamics of the Hamiltonian vector field $\mathcal{X}_H$ defined by a physically relevant smooth function $H : (M, \omega) \to \mathbb{R}$, *e.g.* the sum of kinetic and potential energy. Fix a smooth function $H : (M, \omega) \to \mathbb{R}$; the dynamics of $\mathcal{X}_H$ are confined to level sets of the function $H$, since $\mathrm{d}H(\mathcal{X}_H) = \{H, H\} = 0$. The simplest possible (non-trivial) scenario is when it is possible to constrain the dynamics of $\mathcal{X}_H$ 'as much as possible' by using symmetries or, using Noether's theorem, constants of motion.

**Definition 3.8.** *An* (first) integral *of a Hamiltonian $H \in C^\infty(M)$ is a function that is invariant under the flow of $\mathcal{X}_H$, i.e. a function $f \in C^\infty(M)$ such that $\{H, f\} = 0$.*

Suppose that $H$ admits such a first integral $f_2$ (other that $H$ itself) on a symplectic manifold $M$ of dimension $2n$. Near any point $m$ where $df_2 \neq 0$, one can perform a reduction of the dynamics to a new Hamiltonian system defined by the restriction of $H$ to the space $M_{f_2,h}$ of local $f_2$-orbits near $m$ living in the level set $\{f_2 = f_2(m) =: c_2\}$:

$$M_{f_2,h} := (f_2^{-1}(c_2), m)/\mathcal{X}_{f_2}.$$

We leave to the reader to prove that this (local) $2n-2$ manifold is again symplectic ($\mathcal{X}_{f_2}$ is both tangent and symplectically orthogonal to $f_2^{-1}(c_2)$). Now, if $f_3$ is a new first integral for $H$, which is independent of both $H$ and $f_2$, and whose symmetry (in the sense of Noether) commutes with that of $f_2$, then we can repeat the process of reduction. After $n$ steps, the Hamiltonian system is completely reduced on a zero-dimensional manifold and hence becomes trivial. Unfolding the reduction steps back, we are in principle able to 'completely integrate' the original dynamics, which leads to the following definition (cf. Proposition 3.11).

**Definition 3.9.** *A Hamiltonian $H \in C^\infty(M)$ is* completely integrable *if there exist $n-1$ independent functions $f_2, \ldots, f_n$ which are integrals of $H$ and moreover* pairwise Poisson commute*, i.e. for all $i, j = 2, \ldots, n$, $\{f_i, f_j\} = 0$.*

While from a mechanical perspective, the function $H$ may be significant, Definition 3.9 implies that it does not have any distinguished mathematical role from the other functions $f_2, \ldots, f_n$. This is the perspective of these notes, which motivates the following definition.

**Definition 3.10.** *A* completely integrable Hamiltonian system *is a triple $(M, \omega, F = (f_1, \ldots, f_n))$, where $(M, \omega)$ is a $2n$-dimensional symplectic manifold and the components of $F : (M, \omega) \to \mathbb{R}^n$ are*

- *pairwise in involution, i.e. for all $i, j = 1, \ldots, n$, $\{f_i, f_j\} = 0$, and*
- *functionally independent almost everywhere, i.e. for almost all $p \in M$, $\mathrm{d}_p\Phi$ is onto.*

*The number $n$ denotes the* degrees of freedom *of $(M, \omega, F = (f_1, \ldots, f_n))$*

Throughout these notes, a triple as in Definition 3.10 is simply referred to as an integrable system. In order to explain why the dimension of the symplectic manifold in Definition 3.10 is twice the number of functions, it is worthwhile observing that integrable systems are intimately linked to *Lagrangian foliations*. This is the content of the following result, stated below without proof.

**Proposition 3.11.** *Let $(M, \omega)$ be a $2n$-dimensional symplectic manifold and let $F = (f_1, \dots, f_n) : U \subset M \to \mathbb{R}^n$ be a smooth map such that the differentials $\mathrm{d}f_1, \dots, \mathrm{d}f_n$ are linearly independent at each point of $U$. Then the level sets $F^{-1}(c)$, $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$ define a Lagrangian foliation (on $U$) if and only if, for all $i, j = 1, \dots, n$, $\{f_i, f_j\} = 0$. In this case, the Hamiltonian vector fields $\mathcal{X}_{f_j}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$ span the tangent space of the leaves $F^{-1}(c)$.*

To conclude this section, we prove that integrable systems induce infinitesimal Hamiltonian $\mathbb{R}^n$-actions.

**Lemma 3.12.** *Given an integrable system $(M, \omega, F = (f_1, \dots, f_n))$, the map*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{R}^n &\to \mathfrak{X}_{\mathrm{Ham}}(M) \\ (t_1, \dots, t_n) &\mapsto \sum_{i=1}^{n} t_i \mathcal{X}_{f_i} \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

*is a Lie algebra homomorphism, where $\mathfrak{X}_{\mathrm{Ham}}(M)$ denotes the subalgebra of Hamiltonian vector fields of $\mathfrak{X}(M)$.*

*Proof.* The map of equation (6) is manifestly linear. Thus, to prove the result, it suffices to show that, for all $i, j = 1, \dots, n$, $[\mathcal{X}_{f_i}, \mathcal{X}_{f_j}] = 0$. However, by Lemma 3.5, for any $i, j = 1, \dots, n$, $[\mathcal{X}_{f_i}, \mathcal{X}_{f_j}] = \mathcal{X}_{\{f_i, f_j\}} = \mathcal{X}_0 = 0$. □

### 3.3 Examples of integrable systems

Before proceeding to prove further properties of integrable systems (cf. Section 3.5), we introduce a few examples which are going to be used throughout the notes.

**Example 3.13** (The case $n = 1$)**.** An integrable system on a 2-dimensional symplectic manifold is a smooth function whose differential is non-zero almost everywhere. As a family of more concrete examples, consider a closed, orientable surface of genus $g \geq 0$ embedded in $\mathbb{R}^3$ endowed with the natural area form; the height function defines an integrable system.

Next, we mention a few examples from Hamiltonian mechanics.

**Example 3.14** (The classical spherical pendulum)**.** Identify $T\mathbb{R}^3 \cong T^*\mathbb{R}^3$ using the standard Euclidean metric, so that $T\mathbb{R}^3$ inherits a symplectic form, which, in standard coordinates $(x, y)$, is given by $\Omega = \sum_{i=1}^{3} \mathrm{d}y_i \wedge \mathrm{d}x_i$. Consider furthermore the unit sphere $S^2 \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$; the restriction of $\Omega$ to the submanifold

$TS^2 \hookrightarrow T\mathbb{R}^3$ defines a symplectic form on $TS^2$, henceforth denoted by $\omega$. The restrictions of the functions $H(x,y) = \frac{1}{2}\|y\|^2 + x_3$ and $J(x,y) = x_1y_2 - x_2y_1$ to $TS^2$ define an integrable system known as the spherical pendulum, which has been extensively studied as it is one of the first integrable systems in which *Hamiltonian monodromy* was observed (cf. [22] and references therein).




Figure 1: The image of the moment map $F = (J, H)$ of the spherical pendulum (Example 3.14). The red dots are critical values of rank 0, and the red curve is the set of critical values of rank 1, see Definition 3.26.

**Example 3.15** (Coupled angular momenta on $S^2 \times S^2$, cf. [63])**.** Denote the spheres of radius $a, b > 0$ centered at the origin in $\mathbb{R}^3$ by $S^2_a, S^2_b$. Each sphere is endowed with the standard area form which gives the corresponding sphere the expected area ($4\pi a^2$ and $4\pi b^2$ respectively); these are denoted by $\omega_a, \omega_b$ respectively. Consider the symplectic manifold $\left(S^2 \times S^2, \omega_{a,b}\right)$, where $\omega_{a,b} = \mathrm{pr}_1^*\omega_a + \mathrm{pr}_2^*\omega_b$, and, for $i = 1, 2$, $\mathrm{pr}_i$ denotes projection onto the $i$th component. For any $0 \leq t \leq 1$, the functions

$$H_t := \frac{1-t}{a} y_3 + \frac{t}{ab}\langle x, y\rangle \qquad J := y_3 + x_3,$$

where $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$ and $y = (y_1, y_2, y_3)$ are coordinates on the ambient $\mathbb{R}^3$ for the first and second sphere respectively, define an integrable system

on $\left(S^2 \times S^2, \omega_{a,b}\right)$. For all but two values of $t$, the corresponding integrable system is an example of a semi-toric system (cf. Section 5).

The next family of examples comes from Hamiltonian group actions.

**Example 3.16** (Symplectic toric manifolds)**.** Suppose that an $n$-dimensional torus $\mathbb{T}^n$ acts on a $2n$-dimensional symplectic manifold $(M, \omega)$ effectively[1] by symplectomorphisms. If $\mathfrak{t}$ denotes the Lie algebra of $\mathbb{T}^n$, there is an induced homomorphism of Lie algebras $\mathfrak{t} \to \mathfrak{X}(M)$, sending $\eta$ to $X_\eta$, where, for $p \in M$,

$$X_\eta(p); = \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}|_{t=0} \exp(t\eta) \cdot p,$$

where $\exp : \mathfrak{t} \to \mathbb{T}^n$ denotes the exponential map and $\cdot$ denotes the torus action. Since $\mathfrak{t}$ is abelian, it can be checked that the above map defines an infinitesimal Hamiltonian $\mathfrak{t} \cong \mathbb{R}^n$-action (cf. Lemma 3.12). The group action is said to be *Hamiltonian* if there exists a map, called *moment map* $\mu : M \to \mathfrak{t}^*$, such that, for all $\eta \in \mathfrak{t}$,

$$\omega(X_\eta, \cdot) = -\mathrm{d}\langle \mu, \eta \rangle,$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes the canonical pairing between $\mathfrak{t}$ and $\mathfrak{t}^*$. If the above group action is Hamiltonian, the triple $(M, \omega, \mu)$ is known as a *symplectic toric manifold*. Identifying $\mathfrak{t}^* \cong \mathbb{R}^n$, a symplectic toric manifold defines an integrable system, which is referred to as being *toric*.

The last two examples provide suitable *local normal forms* for integrable systems, cf. Section 3.5.

**Example 3.17** (Local normal forms)**.**

- Consider the standard symplectic vector space $\left(\mathbb{R}^{2n}, \omega_{\mathrm{can}}\right)$ with coordinates $(x, \xi)$ as in Example 3.3. The map $\xi := (\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_n) : \mathbb{R}^{2n} \to \mathbb{R}^n$ defines an integrable system;
- Consider the symplectic manifold $(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{T}^n, \omega_0) \cong (T^*\mathbb{T}^n, \omega_{\mathrm{can}})$ and let $\xi, \theta$ be the standard coordinates on $\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{T}^n = \mathbb{R}^n/\mathbb{Z}^n$ respectively, so that $\omega_0 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathrm{d}\xi_i \wedge \mathrm{d}\theta_i$. The map $\xi := (\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_n) : (\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{T}^n, \omega_0) \to \mathbb{R}^n$ defines an integrable system all of whose fibers are compact.

[1] The only element that acts as the identity at all points of $M$ is the identity of the group.

### 3.4 The classification problem

To prove the first non-trivial properties of integrable systems (cf. Section 3.5), some notion of *equivalence* of integrable systems has to be established. This is a subtle issue, due to the presence of flat functions in the $C^\infty$ category. Loosely speaking, we would like to say that two integrable systems are equivalent if they define 'isomorphic Lagrangian foliations'. To make formal sense of the above idea, we use an algebraic approach.

**Definition 3.18.** *Let $(M, \omega, F = (f_1, \dots, f_n))$ be an integrable system and let $U \subset M$ be open. The* commutant *of $(M, \omega, F)$ in $U$ is*

$$\mathcal{C}_F(U) := \{g \in C^\infty(U) \mid \forall i = 1, \dots, n \ \{f_i, g\} = 0\}.$$

The Leibniz and Jacobi identities yield the following result.

**Corollary 3.19.** *The commutant $\mathcal{C}_F(U)$ of $(M, \omega, F)$ in $U$ is a Poisson subalgebra of $(C^\infty(M), \{\cdot, \cdot\})$.*

Commutants provide the correct algebraic tool to state (local) equivalence of integrable systems defined on a given symplectic manifold.

**Definition 3.20.** *Let $(M, \omega, F)$ and $(M, \omega, G)$ be integrable systems. Say that $F$ and $G$ are* equivalent *on an open subset $U \subset M$ if*

$$\mathcal{C}_F(U) = \mathcal{C}_G(U).$$

*We denote it as $F \sim_U G$.*

The subscript $U$ is omitted whenever it is not ambiguous from the context. It is possible to provide a *geometric* interpretation of Definition 3.20, by introducing the following object.

**Definition 3.21.** *Given an integrable system $(M, \omega, F)$,*

- *a connected component of a fiber of $F$ is called a* leaf*;*
- *its* leaf space *$\mathcal{L}$ is the quotient of $M$ by the equivalence relation which identifies points on the same leaf.*

**Remark 3.22.** The above notion of leaf is *topological* in nature, for there is no guarantee that a leaf in the above sense be a(n immersed) submanifold of the ambient symplectic manifold. △

In general, the leaf space $\mathcal{L}$ of an integrable system $(M, \omega, F)$ need not be a 'nice' topological space. However, continuous functions on it can be identified with continuous functions on $M$ which are constant along the connected components of the fibers of $F$. On the other hand, the commutant $\mathcal{C}_F(M)$ is the algebra of *smooth* functions that are constant on the connected components of the fibers of $F$. Thus it is possible to declare that $\mathcal{C}_F(M)$ to be the space of smooth functions on $\mathcal{L}$. Having done this, $F \sim G$ establishes a (local) *smooth* equivalence between the leaf spaces of the integrable systems $(M, \omega, F)$ and $(M, \omega, G)$.

Finally, we can define a notion of symplectic equivalence between integrable systems.

**Definition 3.23.** *For $i = 1, 2$, let $(M_i, \omega_i, F_i)$ be an integrable system. Say that $(M_1, \omega_1, F_1)$ is* symplectically equivalent *to $(M_2, \omega_2, F_2)$ if there exists a symplectomorphism $\varphi : (M_1, \omega_1) \to (M_2, \omega_2)$ such that $F_1 \sim \varphi^* F_2 := F_2 \circ \varphi$.*

When considering some special families of integrable systems whose leaf spaces are particularly 'nice' (as in the case of the semi-toric systems considered in Section 5), Definition 3.23 is equivalent to the following notion of equivalence of integrable systems, which is geometrically simpler, but *a priori*, stronger.

**Definition 3.24.** *Two integrable systems $(M_1, \omega_1, F_1)$ and $(M_2, \omega_2, F_2)$ are said to be* strongly symplectically equivalent *if there exists a pair $(\varphi, g)$, where $\varphi : (M_1, \omega_1) \to (M_2, \omega_2)$ is a symplectomorphism and $g : F_1(M_1) \to F_2(M_2)$ is a diffeomorphism[2], making the following diagram commute*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (M_1, \omega_1) & \xrightarrow{\varphi} & (M_2, \omega_2) \\ {\scriptstyle F_1}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle F_2} \\ F_1(M_1) & \xrightarrow[g]{} & F_2(M_2). \end{array}$$

**Corollary 3.25.** *Two strongly symplectically equivalent integrable systems are symplectically equivalent.*

## 3.5 Local normal forms: the case of regular points and leaves

The aim of this section is to describe the local structure of an integrable system near regular points and leaves (cf. Theorems 3.28 and 3.31). Intuitively,

[2] *A priori* there is no guarantee that $F_1(M_1)$ is an open subsets of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Throughout these notes, if $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is any subset, a map $H : A \to \mathbb{R}^m$ is said to be *smooth* if for every $x \in A$, there exists an open neighbourhood $W$ and a smooth map $H_W : W \to \mathbb{R}^m$ extending $H|_{A \cap W}$. A diffeomorphism is therefore a smooth map whose inverse is also smooth in the above sense.

these results stem from finding 'integrations' of the infinitesimal $\mathbb{R}^n$-action attached to an integrable system as in Lemma 3.12.

**Definition 3.26.** *Let $(M, \omega, F)$ be an integrable system with $n$ degrees of freedom.*

- *A point $m \in M$ is said to be* regular *for $(M, \omega, F)$ if $dF(m)$ has maximal rank, equal to $n$. Otherwise, $m$ is said to be* singular.
- *A leaf $\Lambda \subset M$ is said to be* regular *if all of its points are regular. Otherwise, it is said to be* singular.

To simplify the statement of results regarding the local normal form of integrable systems, it is useful to observe that they behave well under restrictions.

**Definition 3.27.** *Given an integrable system $(M, \omega, F)$ and an open subset $U \subset M$, its* subsystem relative to $U$ *is the integrable system $(U, \omega|_U, F|_U)$.*

Fix an integrable system $(M, \omega, F)$ and suppose that $m \in M$ is a regular point. Darboux's theorem (cf. [47, Theorem 3.15]) states that, locally near $m$, the symplectic form $\omega$ can be put in standard form; on the other hand, since $F$ is a submersion at $m$, the local normal form for submersions implies that, near $m$, $F$ is simply given by a projection. Thus a natural question is to ask whether it is possible to attain the two above local normal forms *at once*. This is the content of the following well-known result.

**Theorem 3.28** (Darboux-Carathéodory)**.** *Let $(M, \omega, F)$ be an integrable system with $n$ degrees of freedom and let $m \in M$ be regular. Then there exist open subsets $U \subset M$, $V \subset \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ of $m$ and of the origin respectively, such that the subsystem of $(M, \omega, F)$ relative to $U$ is strongly symplectically equivalent to the subsystem of $\left(\mathbb{R}^{2n}, \omega_{\text{can}}, \xi\right)$ (cf. Example 3.17) relative to $V$.*

**Proof.** Using Darboux's theorem and the local normal form for submersions, it may be assumed, without loss of generality, that

- $(M, \omega) = \left(\mathbb{R}^{2n}, \omega_{\text{can}}\right)$, $m = 0$, $F(0) = 0$;
- $F : \mathbb{R}^{2n} \to \mathbb{R}^n$ is a surjective submersion with connected fibers which admits a smooth Lagrangian section $\sigma : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ with $\sigma(0) = 0$ .

The infinitesimal action of Lemma 3.12 yields an action of the bundle of abelian Lie algebras $T^*\mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ (*i.e.* viewing each cotangent space as an abelian Lie algebra) on $F : \mathbb{R}^{2n} \to \mathbb{R}^n$, *i.e.* a Lie algebra homomorphism $\mathfrak{a}$ :

$\Gamma\left(T^*\mathbb{R}^n\right) = \Omega^1\left(\mathbb{R}^n\right) \to \mathfrak{X}\left(\mathbb{R}^{2n}\right)$ with the property that, for all $\alpha \in \Omega^1\left(\mathbb{R}^n\right)$, $\mathfrak{a}\left(\alpha\right) \in \Gamma\left(\ker DF\right)$. Explicitly, if $a = (a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ are coordinates on $\mathbb{R}^n$, if $\alpha = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i \mathrm{d}a_i \in \Omega^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$, then

$$\mathfrak{a}\left(\alpha\right) := \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(F^*\alpha_i\right) \mathcal{X}_{f_i}. \tag{7}$$

For any $\alpha \in \Omega^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$, let $\phi_\alpha^t$ denote the flow at time $t$ of $\mathfrak{a}\left(\alpha\right)$; observe that, whenever it is defined, $F \circ \phi_\alpha^t = F$. Just as in the case of actions of Lie algebras, such an action can be integrated to an action of a bundle of local abelian Lie groups, *i.e.* there exists an open neighborhood $W \subset T^*\mathbb{R}^n$ of the zero section such that the map

$$\begin{aligned} A : W \times_{\mathbb{R}^n} \mathbb{R}^{2n} &\to \mathbb{R}^{2n} \\ (\alpha, p) &\mapsto \phi_\alpha^{2\pi}(p) \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

is an action[3] of $W$ on $F : \mathbb{R}^{2n} \to \mathbb{R}^n$, where $\times_{\mathbb{R}^n}$ denotes fibered product over $\mathbb{R}^n$. This means that, for all $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$, there exists an open neighborhood $W_c \subset T_c^*\mathbb{R}^n$ of the origin and an action of the local abelian Lie group $W_c$ on $F^{-1}(c)$. Consider the map $\Psi_\sigma : W \to \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ defined by $\Psi_\sigma(\alpha) := A\left(\alpha, \sigma\left(\mathrm{pr}\left(\alpha\right)\right)\right)$, where $\mathrm{pr} : T^*\mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ is the natural projection; since near the zero section the differential $D\Psi_\sigma$ is invertible and by local freeness of the action of equation (8), it follows that $\Psi_\sigma$ is a diffeomorphism of some open neighborhood of the zero section in $W$ to some open neighborhood of $\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n) \subset \mathbb{R}^{2n}$. Moreover, $F \circ \Psi_\sigma = \mathrm{pr}$ by construction and $\Psi^*\omega_{\mathrm{can}} = \omega_{\mathrm{can}} + \mathrm{pr}^*\sigma^*\omega_{\mathrm{can}} = \omega_{\mathrm{can}}$ (cf. [19, Theorem 3.1]), where, by abuse of notation, $\omega_{\mathrm{can}}$ denotes the canonical symplectic form on $\mathbb{R}^{2n} \cong T^*\mathbb{R}^n$. The last equality follows from the fact that $\sigma$ is Lagrangian. Therefore, the integrable system $\left(\mathbb{R}^{2n}, \omega_{\mathrm{can}}, F\right)$ is strongly symplectically equivalent (locally near 0) to $(T^*\mathbb{R}^n, \omega_{\mathrm{can}}, \mathrm{pr})$, which, upon using the standard trivialization for $T^*\mathbb{R}^n$, can be identified with $\left(\mathbb{R}^{2n}, \omega_{\mathrm{can}}, \xi\right)$. □

**Remark 3.29.** It is a useful exercise to unravel the above proof using local coordinates. If $F = (f_1, \ldots, f_n)$ and $m \in M$ is regular, then Theorem 3.28 simply says that there exist smooth functions $\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_n$ defined locally near $m$ such that, $f_1 - f_1(m), \ldots, f_n - f_n(m), \xi_1, \ldots, \xi_n$ are Darboux coordinates near $m$. △

A nice application of Theorem 3.28 is the following strengthening of Corollary 3.19.

[3] This means that all the standard axioms for actions are verified whenever the compositions are possible.

**Corollary 3.30.** *Let $(M, \omega, F)$ be an integrable system and let $U \subset M$ be an open subset. The commutant $\mathcal{C}_F(U)$ is an abelian Poisson subalgebra.*

*Proof.* Theorem 3.28 implies that if $U$ consists solely of regular points, then $\mathcal{C}_F(U)$ is abelian. If $U$ contains singular points, observe that, by definition, there exists an open, dense subset $U' \subset U$ consisting of regular points. This reduces the problem to the previous case and, thus, completes the proof. □

Having established Theorem 3.28, we turn to the question of describing the structure of an integrable system in a neighborhood of a *compact* regular leaf. This is the content of the following result, which is is usually associated with the names of Liouville, Mineur and Arnol'd.

**Theorem 3.31** (Action-angle variables)**.** *Let $(M, \omega, F)$ be an integrable system with $n$ degrees of freedom and suppose that $\Lambda_c \subset F^{-1}(c)$ is a compact regular leaf. Then there exist open neighborhoods $U \subset M$, $V \subset T^*\mathbb{T}^n \cong \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{T}^n$ of $\Lambda_c$ and of the zero section respectively, saturated with respect to the maps $F$ and $\mathrm{pr} : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{T}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ respectively, such that the subsystem of $(M, \omega, F)$ relative to $U$ is strongly symplectically equivalent to the subsystem of $(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{T}^n, \omega_0, \xi)$ (cf. Example 3.17) relative to $V$.*

An immediate consequence of Theorem 3.31 is the following result, which is usually stated as part of the existence of action-angle variables.

**Corollary 3.32.** *Let $(M, \omega, F)$ be an integrable system with $n$ degrees of freedom and suppose that $\Lambda_c \subset F^{-1}(c)$ is a compact regular leaf. Then $\Lambda_c \cong \mathbb{T}^n$ and there exists an $F$-saturated, open neighborhood $U \subset M$ such that $F|_U$ is locally trivial.*

There are several proofs of slight variations of the statement of Theorem 3.31 in the literature (cf. [3, 22], [31, Section 44] amongst others). In the proof presented below we combine ideas from [30, Section 44], together with an argument that allows to reduce the problem to the one considered in *op. cit.*

*Proof.* The first step is to show that, by restricting to a suitable open neighborhood of $\Lambda_c$, it may be assumed, without loss of generality, that $F$ is a proper submersion with connected fibers. This is a consequence of the following differential topological fact.

**Claim.** Let $F : M \to N$ be a smooth map and suppose that $\Lambda \subset F^{-1}(q)$ is a compact, connected component consisting solely of regular points. Then there exists an $F$-saturated open neighborhood $U \subset M$ of $\Lambda$ such that $F|_U$ is a proper submersion with connected fibers.

Thus suppose that $F : M \to \mathbb{R}^n$ is a proper submersion whose fibers are connected; without loss of generality, it may be assumed to be onto. Henceforth, the argument is as in [31, Section 44] and is outlined below for completeness. As in the proof of Theorem 3.28, consider the infinitesimal action $\mathfrak{a} : \Omega^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \to \mathfrak{X}(M)$ of $T^*\mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ on $F : M \to \mathbb{R}^n$ given by equation (7). Compactness of the fibers of $F$ imply that the flow $\phi_\alpha^t$ of $\mathfrak{a}(\alpha)$ exists for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, where $\alpha \in \Omega^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Therefore, the infinitesimal action $\mathfrak{a}$ integrates to an action of the bundle of abelian Lie groups $T^*\mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ on $F : M \to \mathbb{R}^n$ which is given by equation (8). (The only difference being that this integrated action is defined on the whole of $T^*\mathbb{R}^n$!) For each $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the abelian Lie group $T_c^*\mathbb{R}^n$ acts on $F^{-1}(c)$; for $p \in F^{-1}(c)$, let $A_p := A(-, p) : T_c^*\mathbb{R}^n \to F^{-1}(c)$ be the smooth map induced by the action $A$. Since, for all $p \in F^{-1}(c)$, $D_0 A_p$ is an isomorphism, connectedness of $F^{-1}(c)$ implies that the action of $T_c^*\mathbb{R}^n$ on $F^{-1}(c)$ is transitive (cf. [31, Page 351]). Fix $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$; for $p \in F^{-1}(c)$, consider the isotropy at $p$ of the action of $T_c^*\mathbb{R}^n$ on $F^{-1}(c)$,

$$\Sigma_p := \left\{ \alpha \in T_c^*\mathbb{R}^n \mid \phi_\alpha^{2\pi}(p) = p \right\}.$$

Since $T_c^*\mathbb{R}^n$ is abelian, the isotropy subgroups of any two points $p, p' \in F^{-1}(c)$ are *canonically* isomorphic; thus obtain a well-defined subgroup

$$\Sigma_c := \left\{ \alpha \in T_c^*\mathbb{R}^n \mid \exists\, p \in F^{-1}(c)\,,\, \phi_\alpha^{2\pi}(p) = p \right\},$$

and $F^{-1}(c) \cong T_c^*\mathbb{R}^n / \Sigma_c$. Since $T_c^*\mathbb{R}^n$ is abelian and has the same dimension as the compact submanifold $F^{-1}(c)$, it follows that $\Sigma_c \cong \mathbb{Z}^n$ and that $F^{-1}(c) \cong \mathbb{T}^n$. Set

$$\Sigma := \bigcup_{c \in \mathbb{R}^n} \Sigma_c \subset T^*\mathbb{R}^n; \tag{9}$$

it is a *smooth Lagrangian* submanifold and the projection $\Sigma \to \mathbb{R}^n$ is a $\mathbb{Z}^n$*-bundle*, *i.e.* it is a fiber bundle with fiber isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}^n$ and whose structure group is $\mathrm{GL}(n; \mathbb{Z})$. (It is important to observe that smoothness of $\Sigma$ is not trivial to prove, cf. [31, Theorem 44.4] and references therein.) Since $\mathbb{R}^n$ is contractible, the map $F : M \to \mathbb{R}^n$ admits a globally defined smooth section $\sigma : \mathbb{R}^n \to M$. As in the proof of Theorem 3.28, consider the smooth map $\Psi_\sigma : T^*\mathbb{R}^n \to M$ induced by the above action $A$, *i.e.* $\Psi_\sigma(\alpha) = A\left(\alpha, \sigma\left(\mathrm{pr}(\alpha)\right)\right)$, where $\mathrm{pr} : T^*\mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ denotes the standard projection. This map descends to a diffeomorphism $\hat{\Psi}_\sigma : T^*\mathbb{R}^n / \Sigma \to M$ which sends the zero section to $\sigma$, since $\Sigma$ is precisely the isotropy of the action $A$. Since $\Sigma$ is Lagrangian, $T^*\mathbb{R}^n / \Sigma$ inherits a symplectic form $\omega_0$ and $\hat{\Psi}_\sigma^* \omega = \omega_0 + \mathrm{pr}^* \sigma^* \omega$ (cf. [19, Theorem 3.1]). Thus the integrable system $(M, \omega, F)$ is strongly

symplectically equivalent to $(T^*\mathbb{R}^n/\Sigma, \omega_0 + \mathrm{pr}^*\beta, \mathrm{pr})$, where $\beta$ is a closed 2-form and, by abuse of notation, $\mathrm{pr} : T^*\mathbb{R}^n/\Sigma \to \mathbb{R}^n$ denotes the induced projection. Since $\mathbb{R}^n$ is contractible, $\beta = \mathrm{d}\gamma$ for some 1-form $\gamma$; consider the section $-\hat{\gamma} : \mathbb{R}^n \to T^*\mathbb{R}^n/\Sigma$ induced by $-\gamma$. Then, since $\omega_0$ descends from the canonical symplectic form on $T^*\mathbb{R}^n$, it follows that $-\hat{\gamma}$ is Lagrangian. Repeating the above argument, obtain that $(T^*\mathbb{R}^n/\Sigma, \omega_0 + \mathrm{pr}^*\beta, \mathrm{pr})$ is strongly symplectically equivalent to $(T^*\mathbb{R}^n/\Sigma, \omega_0, \mathrm{pr})$. Since $\mathbb{R}^n$ is contractible, the $\mathbb{Z}^n$-bundle $\Sigma \to \mathbb{R}^n$ is trivializable. Fixing a trivialization allows to identify $(T^*\mathbb{R}^n/\Sigma, \omega_0, \mathrm{pr})$ with the required integrable system $(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{T}^n, \omega_0, \xi)$, thus completing the proof. □

**Remark 3.33.** Theorem 3.31 can be interpreted as saying that, as a Lagrangian foliation, the only invariant of an integrable system $(M, \omega, F)$ in a neighborhood of a regular, compact connected component of a fiber of $F$ is the number of degrees of freedom. However, a closer look at the proof of Theorem 3.31 yields *symplectic* invariants of the map $F$ as follows. Being by observing that the fact that the *bundle of periods* $\Sigma \subset T^*\mathbb{R}^n$ is Lagrangian follows from the fact that any (local) section of $\Sigma \to \mathbb{R}^n$ is a *closed* form (cf. [31, Section 44] and references therein). Let $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n$ denote a frame for $\Sigma \to \mathbb{R}^n$; $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n$ are symplectic invariants of $F$ itself since they are determined by periods of periodic trajectories of the initial system. Moreover, (locally) these are exact forms, so there exist functions $g_1, \ldots, g_n$ such that, for all $i = 1, \ldots, n$, $\alpha_i = \mathrm{d}g_i$. Observe that the composition $g \circ F : M \to \mathbb{R}^n$, where $g := (g_1, \ldots, g_n)$ can be viewed as the moment map of an effective Hamiltonian $\mathbb{T}^n$-action, *i.e.* for each $i$, $\mathcal{X}_{(g\circ F)_i}$ has flow which is periodic with period 1. Finally, it is worth mentioning that there is an explicit formula for the functions $g_1, \ldots, g_n$. Let $\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathrm{H}_1(\mathbb{T}^n; \mathbb{Z})$ be a smooth map associating to each $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$ a base of $\mathrm{H}_1\left(F^{-1}(c); \mathbb{Z}\right) \cong \mathrm{H}_1(\mathbb{T}^n; \mathbb{Z})$ (locally such a map always exists). Fix $c_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$; then, in an $F$-saturated neighborhood $W \subset M$ of $F^{-1}(c_0)$, the symplectic form $\omega$ is exact, say equal to $\mathrm{d}\sigma$ . Then, for $i = 1, \ldots, n$,

$$g_i(c) := \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\gamma_i(c)} \sigma, \tag{10}$$

(cf. [22]). △

**Remark 3.34.** The advantage of the proofs of Theorems 3.28 and 3.31 as presented above is that they easily generalize to more general settings of Hamiltonian integrability (the so-called *non-commutative* case, cf. [19]), and

to more general geometric structures than symplectic forms (*e.g.* almost-symplectic, contact, Poisson structures, cf. [27, 38, 64, 65]). △

## 3.6 The global counterpart of action-angle coordinates: integral affine structures

While Theorem 3.31 establishes the existence of *local* action-angle variables, there are topological obstructions to the existence of *global* ones, as first observed in [22]. However, even if an integrable system does not admit global action-angle variables, there is a globally defined geometric structure, invariant under strong symplectic equivalence (cf. Definition 3.24), which encodes all possible local action variables, an observation which is also due to Duistermaat in [22]. Throughout this section, fix an integrable system $(M, \omega, F)$ all of whose fibers are compact and let $\mathcal{L}$ denote its leaf space (cf. Definition 3.21).

**Definition 3.35.** *The subset $\mathcal{L}_{\text{reg}} \subset \mathcal{L}$ corresponding to regular leaves is called the* regular leaf space *of $(M, \omega, F)$.*

The pair $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}_{\text{reg}})$ is an invariant of a $(M, \omega, F)$ in the following sense.

**Corollary 3.36.** *If two integrable systems $(M_1, \omega_1, F_1)$, $(M_2, \omega_2, F_2)$ are strongly symplectically equivalent, then their pairs of leaf and regular leaf spaces are homeomorphic as pairs.*

Under the assumption that all fibers are compact, regular leaf spaces are well-behaved topologically (cf. [51, Section 2.4]).

**Lemma 3.37.** *If all fibers are compact, the regular leaf space $\mathcal{L}_{\text{reg}}$ of $(M, \omega, F)$ is open in $\mathcal{L}$, is Hausdorff, locally compact and second countable.*

In fact, Theorem 3.31 can be used to endow $\mathcal{L}_{\text{reg}}$ with the structure of a smooth manifold whose changes of coordinates are 'rigid'.

**Definition 3.38.** *An* integral affine structure *on an Hausdorff, second countable, locally compact topological space $N$ is a smooth atlas $\mathcal{A} = \{(W_i, \chi_i)\}$ such that, for all $i, j$ with $W_i \cap W_j \neq \emptyset$, the restriction of $\chi_j \circ \chi_i^{-1} : \chi_i(W_i \cap W_j) \subset \mathbb{R}^n \to \chi_j(W_i \cap W_j) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ to each connected component of $\chi_i(W_i \cap W_j)$ is (the restriction of) an element of the group*

$$\mathrm{AGL}(n; \mathbb{Z}) := \mathrm{GL}(n; \mathbb{Z}) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^n.$$

*A pair $(N, \mathcal{A})$ where $N$ and $\mathcal{A}$ are as above is said to be an* integral affine manifold.

**Corollary 3.39.** *Let $(M, \omega, F)$ be an integrable system all of whose fibers are compact. Then its regular leaf space $\mathcal{L}_{\text{reg}}$ inherits an integral affine structure $\mathcal{A}$ uniquely defined by the property that $\chi : W \subset \mathcal{L}_{\text{reg}} \to \mathbb{R}^n$ is an integral affine coordinate chart if and only if $q \circ \chi : \left(q^{-1}(W), \omega|_{q^{-1}(W)}\right) \to \mathbb{R}^n$ is the moment map of an effective Hamiltonian $\mathbb{T}^n$-action, where $q : M \to \mathcal{L}$ is the quotient map.*

*Proof.* Let $[p] \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{reg}}$; this corresponds to a compact, regular leaf $\Lambda$. Unravelling the definitions, Theorem 3.31 guarantees the existence of an open neighborhood $W \subset \mathcal{L}_{\text{reg}}$ of $[p]$ together with a map $\chi : W \to \mathbb{R}^n$ with the property that $q \circ \chi$ is the moment map of an effective Hamiltonian $\mathbb{T}^n$-action (cf. Remark 3.33). This defines the atlas $\mathcal{A}$. To check that it induces an integral affine structure, it suffices to observe that the differential of the components of $\chi$ locally generate the bundle of periods; thus if $\chi_i, \chi_j$ are coordinate maps defined on a connected, non-empty open set, their differentials are related by an element of $\mathrm{GL}(n; \mathbb{Z})$ since this is the structure group of the bundle of periods. To obtain the required result, integrate this equality. Checking that this integral affine structure is uniquely defined by the above property is left as an exercise to the reader. □

The integral affine manifold $(\mathcal{L}_{\text{reg}}, \mathcal{A})$ is an invariant of integrable systems up to strong symplectic equivalence.

**Remark 3.40.** Integral affine structures appear naturally in other problems related to Poisson geometry: for instance, in the study of Poisson manifolds of compact types (cf. [14, 15, 83]). △

# 4 Almost-toric singular fibers

Throughout this section, any integrable system is assumed to have compact fibers unless otherwise stated. The aim of this section is to study a family of singular leaves/fibers of integrable systems; the starting point is the following result, stated without proof.

**Corollary 4.1.** *Given an integrable system $(M, \omega, F = (f_1, \ldots, f_n))$ with compact fibers, for each $i = 1, \ldots, n$, the Hamiltonian vector field $\mathcal{X}_{f_i}$ is complete. In particular, the map*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{R}^n \times M &\to M \\ ((t_1, \ldots, t_n), p) &\mapsto \phi_1^{t_1} \circ \ldots \circ \phi_n^{t_n}(p), \end{aligned}$$

*where, for each $i = 1, \ldots, n$, $\phi_i^s$ is the flow of $\mathcal{X}_{f_i}$ at time $s$, defines a Hamiltonian $\mathbb{R}^n$-action on $(M, \omega)$ one of whose moment maps is $F$.*

Definition 4.2 motivates referring to $F$ as the *moment map* of the integrable system $(M, \omega, F)$. With the above Hamiltonian $\mathbb{R}^n$-action at hand, it is possible to extend the notions introduced in Definition 3.26.

**Definition 4.2.** *Let $(M, \omega, F)$ be a completely integrable system.*

- *The* rank *of a point $p \in M$ is defined to be* $\operatorname{rk} p := \operatorname{rk} D_p F$*;*
- *If $p \in M$ is singular (respectively regular), the $\mathbb{R}^n$-orbit $\mathcal{O}_p$ through $p$ is said to be* singular *(respectively* regular*).*

**Corollary 4.3.** *Let $(M, \omega, F)$ be a completely integrable system. The rank of a point $p \in M$ equals the dimension of its orbit $\mathcal{O}_p$ which is diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{T}^{c(p)} \times \mathbb{R}^{\operatorname{rk} p - c(p)}$ for some non-negative integer $c(p)$.*

When studying the topology or (symplectic) geometry near a singular point of an integrable system, there are several 'scales' that can be adopted, namely near the point, near the orbit through the point, or near the leaf containing the point. The first two 'scales' are often referred to in the literature as *local*, while the last one is known as *semi-local*. The first difference between the regular and singular cases is that in the latter it is not necessarily true that an orbit need coincide with a leaf. In full generality, there are no results characterizing neighborhoods of singular points/orbits/leaves: intuitively, this is because, given a completely integrable system, the underlying Hamiltonian $\mathbb{R}^n$-action is not necessarily proper. Thus we need to introduce a 'suitable' restriction on the types of singular points/orbits that allows for a geometric treatment. Here, 'suitable' means that it appears naturally in many physical problems while also being generic in an appropriate mathematical sense.

## 4.1 Non-degeneracy and Eliasson's theorem

The property of singular points/orbits introduced below can be thought of as a 'symplectic Morse-Bott condition' (cf. [43, Exercise 2]). In what follows, the definition of non-degenerate singular points is split in two cases: first, fixed points (*i.e.* of rank 0) are dealt with and then the general case is considered. Fix an integrable system $(M, \omega, F = (f_1, \ldots, f_n))$ and suppose that $p \in M$ is a singular point of rank 0. This means that, for all $i = 1, \ldots, n$, $\mathcal{X}_{f_i}(p) = 0$. For $t = (t_1, \ldots, t_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, set $\phi_F^t := \phi_1^{t_1} \circ \ldots \circ \phi_n^{t_n}$. The condition

on $p$ having rank equal to 0 means that, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\phi_F^t(p) = p$. Thus, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $D_p\phi_F^t : T_pM \to T_pM$ is an isomorphism; moreover, since $\phi_F^t$ is a symplectomorphism of $(M, \omega)$, it follows that $D_p\phi_F^t$ is a linear symplectomorphism, *i.e.* $D_p\phi_F^t \in \mathrm{Sp}\,(T_pM, \omega_p)$. By choosing local Darboux coordinates centred at $p$, $\mathrm{Sp}\,(T_pM, \omega_p) = \mathrm{Sp}\left(\mathbb{R}^{2n}, \omega_0\right)$, where $\omega_0$ denotes the canonical symplectic form. Thus we obtain a Lie group morphism $\mathbb{R}^n \to \mathrm{Sp}\,(\mathbb{R}^n, \Omega_{\mathrm{can}})$, which induces a Lie algebra morphism $\mathbb{R}^n \to \mathfrak{sp}(2n; \mathbb{R})$ whose image is henceforth denoted by $\mathfrak{h}_p$.

**Definition 4.4.** *A singular point $p \in M$ of rank 0 is said to be* non-degenerate *if $\mathfrak{h}_p$ is a Cartan subalgebra of $\mathfrak{sp}(2n; \mathbb{R})$.*

**Remark 4.5.** By definition, $\mathfrak{h}_p \subset \mathfrak{sp}(2n; \mathbb{R})$ is an abelian subalgebra. It is Cartan if it has maximal dimension equal to $n$ and if it is *self-normalising*, *i.e.* if $\mathfrak{h}_p = \{A \in \mathfrak{sp}(2n; \mathbb{R}) \mid \forall\, B \in \mathfrak{h}_p \quad [A, B] \in \mathfrak{h}_p\}$. △

**Remark 4.6.** The above construction can be viewed equivalently as follows. Since the Hamiltonian vector fields $\mathcal{X}_{f_1}(p), \ldots, \mathcal{X}_{f_n}(p)$ all vanish, it is possible to consider their linearisations at $p$, $\mathcal{X}_{f_1}^{\mathrm{lin}}(p), \ldots, \mathcal{X}_{f_n}^{\mathrm{lin}}(p) \in \mathfrak{gl}\,(T_pM)$. These linear operators pairwise commute, since for all $i, j$, $[\mathcal{X}_{f_i}, \mathcal{X}_{f_j}] = 0$, and are, in fact, symplectic . Therefore, obtain a representation $\mathbb{R}^n \to \mathfrak{sp}\,(T_pM, \omega_p) = \mathfrak{sp}\,(2n, \mathbb{R})$, which is precisely the above homomorphism of Lie algebras. △

To deal with the general case, suppose that $p \in M$ is a singular point of rank $k$. Without loss of generality, it may be assumed that for all $i = 1, \ldots, n-k$, $\mathrm{d}_p f_i = 0$, so that $\mathrm{d}_p f_{n-k+1} \wedge \ldots \wedge \mathrm{d}_p f_n \neq 0$ . Let $\mathcal{O}_p \subset M$ denote the $\mathbb{R}^n$-orbit through $p$. In analogy with the argument in the rank 0 case, get a Lie algebra morphism $\mathbb{R}^{n-k} \to \mathfrak{sp}(2n; \mathbb{R})$ whose image is denoted by $\tilde{\mathfrak{h}}_p$. However, it can be shown that if $A \in \tilde{\mathfrak{h}}_p$, then $T_p\mathcal{O}_p \subset \ker A$ and that $\mathrm{im}\, A$ is contained in the symplectic orthogonal $(T_p\mathcal{O}_p)^{\Omega}$. Therefore, obtain a Lie algebra homomorphism $\mathbb{R}^{n-k} \to \mathfrak{sp}\,(2(n-k); \mathbb{R})$, whose image is denoted by $\mathfrak{h}_p$.

**Definition 4.7.** *A singular point $p \in M$ of rank $k$ is said to be* non-degenerate *if $\mathfrak{h}_p$ is a Cartan subalgebra of $\mathfrak{sp}\,(2(n-k); \mathbb{R})$.*

The above notion of non-degeneracy has several advantages. First, it is *infinitesimal* (or *linear*), which makes it (theoretically) easy to check. Second, Cartan subalgebras of $\mathfrak{sp}(2n; \mathbb{R})$ have been classified up to conjugation in [79]; this result is recalled below without proof. In the statement of Theorem 4.8, the isomorphism of Lie algebras between $\mathfrak{sp}(2n; \mathbb{R})$ and $\mathrm{Sym}(2n; \mathbb{R})$ of symmetric bilinear form on the canonical symplectic vector space $(\mathbb{R}^{2n}, \omega_0)$ is used (cf. [43, Exercise 13]).

**Theorem 4.8** (Williamson, [79])**.**

- *Let* $\mathfrak{h} \subset \mathrm{Sym}(2n;\mathbb{R})$ *be a Cartan subalgebra. Then there exists canonical coordinates* $x_j, y_j$ *for* $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$*, a triple* $(k_e, k_h, k_{ff}) \in \mathbb{Z}^3_{\geq 0}$ *with* $k_e + k_h + 2k_{ff} = n$*, and a basis* $f_1, \ldots, f_n$ *of* $\mathfrak{h}$ *such that*

$$f_i = \begin{cases} \frac{x_i^2+y_i^2}{2} & \text{if } i = 1, \ldots, k_e \\ x_i y_i & \text{if } i = k_e+1, \ldots, k_e+k_h \\ x_i y_{i+1} - x_{i+1} y_i & \text{if } i = k_e+k_h+1, k_e+k_h+3, \ldots, \\ x_i y_i + x_{i+1} y_{i+1} & k_e+k_h+2l-1, \ldots, k_e+k_h+2k_{ff}-1. \end{cases} \tag{11}$$

- *Two Cartan subalgebras* $\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{h}' \subset \mathrm{Sym}(2n;\mathbb{R})$ *are conjugate if and only if their corresponding triples are equal.*

**Definition 4.9.** *Elements of the basis of a Cartan subalgebra* $\mathfrak{h} \subset \mathrm{Sym}(2n;\mathbb{R})$ *as in Theorem 4.8 are said to be* elliptic*,* hyperbolic *or of* focus-focus *type according to whether they are of the form* $\frac{x_i^2+y_i^2}{2}$*,* $x_i, y_i$ *or a pair* $x_i y_{i+1} - x_{i+1} y_i$*,* $x_i y_i + x_{i+1} y_{i+1}$ *respectively.*

One way of phrasing Theorem 4.8 is that a Cartan subalgebra of $\mathfrak{sp}(2n;\mathbb{R})$ is completely determined by a triple $(k_e, k_h, k_{ff}) \in \mathbb{Z}^3_{\geq 0}$ satisfying $k_e + k_h + k_{ff} = n$, where $k_e$ (respectively $k_h, k_{ff}$) denotes the number of elliptic components (respectively hyperbolic components and focus-focus pairs) appearing in the basis constructed above.

**Definition 4.10** (Zung, [80])**.** *Let* $p \in M$ *be a non-degenerate singular point of rank* $0 \leq k < n$*. Its* Williamson type *is a quadruple* $(k, k_e, k_h, k_{ff}) \in \mathbb{Z}^4_{\geq 0}$ *satisfying* $k + k_e + k_h + 2k_{ff} = n$*, where* $(k_e, k_h, k_{ff})$ *is the triple associated to the Cartan subalgebra* $\mathfrak{h}_p \subset \mathfrak{sp}\,(2(n-k);\mathbb{R})$*.*

The above notion is invariant along orbits, *i.e.* if $p$ is non-degenerate, then all points on $\mathcal{O}_p$ are non-degenerate of the same Williamson type (cf. [43, Exercise 15]). Therefore, it makes sense to talk about the Williamson type of an *orbit*.

**Remark 4.11.** In general, it does not make sense to talk about the Williamson type of a leaf. For instance, a singular leaf may contain a regular orbit (cf. Remark 4.13). Moreover, the distinct singular orbits lying on a singular leaf need not all have the same Williamson type. △

Non-degeneracy singular points can be *linearized*: this is the content of Theorem 4.14. Let $(M, \omega, F)$ be an integrable system and suppose that

$p \in M$ is a non-degenerate singular point of Williamson type $(k, k_e, k_h, k_f)$. The following definition associates to such a quadruple a 'model' integrable system.

**Definition 4.12.** *Given a quadruple* $\mathbf{k} = (k, k_e, k_h, k_{ff}) \in \mathbb{Z}^4_{\geq 0}$ *satisfying* $k+k_e+k_h+2k_{ff} = n$*, the* local model of a singular point of Williamson type $\mathbf{k}$ *is the integrable system* $\left(\mathbb{R}^{2n}, \omega_0, Q_{\mathbf{k}} = (q_1, \ldots, q_n)\right)$*, where* $\omega_0 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathrm{d}x_i \wedge \mathrm{d}y_i$ *is the canonical symplectic form, and*

$$q_i(x_1, y_1, \ldots, x_n, y_n) = \begin{cases} y_i & \text{if } i = 1, \ldots, k, \\ \frac{x_i^2+y_i^2}{2} & \text{if } i = k+1, \ldots, k+k_e, \\ x_i y_i & \text{if } i = k+k_e+1, \ldots, k+k_e+k_h, \end{cases} \tag{12}$$

*and the remaining ones are focus-focus pairs in the coordinates* $(x_i, y_i, x_{i+1}, y_{i+1})$*, for* $i = k+k_e+k_h+1, k+k_e+k_h+3, \ldots, k+k_e+k_h+2k_{ff}-1$.

For any local model of a singular point of Williamson type $\mathbf{k}$, it is easily checked that all singular points are non-degenerate and that the origin has Williamson type $\mathbf{k}$ (cf. [43, Exercise 7]).

**Remark 4.13.** Given a local model of Williamson type $\mathbf{k} = (k, k_e, k_h, k_{ff})$ with $k + k_e + k_h + 2k_{ff} = n$, the following hold:

- There is a Hamiltonian $\mathbb{R}^n$-action on $\left(\mathbb{R}^{2n}, \omega_0\right)$ one of whose moment maps is $Q_{\mathbf{k}}$;
- If $k_h > 0$, the fibres of $Q_{\mathbf{k}}$ are not connected;
- If $k_h + k_{ff} > 0$, there exist leaves which contain more than one orbit of the above Hamiltonian $\mathbb{R}^n$-action.

△

A natural question to ask is whether a sufficiently small neighbourhood of a non-degenerate singular point of Williamson type $\mathbf{k}$ is equivalent to the local model of Williamson type $\mathbf{k}$. This is the content of the following result, stated below without proof.

**Theorem 4.14** (Eliasson, [25])**.** *Suppose that* $(M, \omega, F)$ *is an integrable system and let* $p \in M$ *be a non-degenerate singular point of Williamson type* $\mathbf{k} = (k, k_e, k_h, k_{ff})$*. Then there exist open neighbourhoods* $U \subset M$ *of* $p$ *and* $V \subset \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ *of the origin such that the subsystems of* $(M, \omega, F)$ *and of* $\left(\mathbb{R}^{2n}, \omega_0, Q_{\mathbf{k}}\right)$ *relative to* $U$ *and* $V$ *respectively are symplectically equivalent. If* $k_h = 0$*, the above subsystems are strongly symplectically equivalent.*

**Remark 4.15.** In the real analytic setting, Theorem 4.14 can be strengthened to make the above subsystems strongly symplectically equivalence (cf. [62] for the case of two degrees of freedom and [75] for the general case). The issue with the smooth case is the presence of flat functions, which, when $k_h \neq 0$, may prevent strong equivalence. To illustrate the situation if $k_h \neq 0$, consider the following two results. In the case of one degree of freedom, strong symplectic equivalence can be attained *even* if $k_h = 1$ (cf. [13]); on the other hand, starting with $n \geq 2$ degrees of freedom, there are counterexamples to strong symplectic equivalence (cf. [6, Appendix]). △

**Remark 4.16.** While Theorem 4.14 is generally referred to as Eliasson's theorem, it is worthwhile mentioning that a complete, self-contained proof of it has not appeared in the literature, but can be gathered by combining results from various authors (cf. [6, 12, 13, 21, 26, 25, 48, 49, 50, 62, 74, 75] amongst others). △

While singular orbits with $k_h > 0$ arise naturally in many mathematical and physical problems (*e.g.* the height function of a torus, the mathematical pendulum), in what follows, only singular orbits with $k_h = 0$ are considered. Before restricting further to the case of 2 degrees of freedom (cf. Section 4.2), we mention a useful extension of Theorem 4.14 to the case of *compact* orbits whose Williamson type is of the form $(k, k_e, 0, 0)$, whose proof can be found in [21]. Such orbits are henceforth referred to as *purely elliptic*. In analogy with Definition 4.12, we introduce the following local model in a neighborhood of such a compact orbit[4].

**Definition 4.17.** *Given a quadruple* $\mathbf{k} = (k, k_e, 0, 0) \in \mathbb{Z}^4_{\geq 0}$ *satisfying* $k + k_e = n$, *the* local model of a compact singular orbit of Williamson type $(k, k_e, 0, 0)$ *is the integrable system*

$$\left(T^*\mathbb{T}^k \times \mathbb{R}^{2(n-k)}, \omega = \omega_{\text{can}} \oplus \omega_0, Q_{\mathbf{k}} = (q_1, \ldots, q_n)\right),$$

*where* $\omega_{\text{can}} = \sum_{j=1}^{k} \mathrm{d}\xi_i \wedge \mathrm{d}\theta_i$, $\omega_0 = \sum_{i=1}^{n-k} \mathrm{d}x_i \wedge \mathrm{d}y_i$ *are the canonical symplectic forms, and*

$$q_i(\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_k, \xi_1, \ldots, \xi_k, x_1, \ldots, x_{n-k}, y_1, , y_{n-k}) = \begin{cases} \xi_i & \text{if } i = 1, \ldots, k, \\ \frac{x_i^2 + y_i^2}{2} & \text{if } i = k+1, \ldots, n. \end{cases} \tag{13}$$

[4]It is possible to introduce a local model for a compact orbit of *any* Williamson type (cf. [50]), but this is beyond the scope of these notes.

**Theorem 4.18** (Dufour and Molino, [21]). *Suppose that $(M, \omega, F)$ is an integrable system and that $\mathcal{O} \subset M$ is a non-degenerate compact orbit of Williamson type $(k, k_e, 0, 0)$, where $k + k_e = n$. Then there exist open neighborhoods $U \subset M$, $V \subset T^*\mathbb{T}^k \times \mathbb{R}^{2(n-k)}$ of $\mathcal{O}$ and of $\mathbb{T}^k \times \{0\}$ respectively, such that the subsystems of $(M, \omega, F)$ and of*

$$\left(T^*\mathbb{T}^k \times \mathbb{R}^{2(n-k)},\, \omega = \omega_{\text{can}} \oplus \omega_0,\, Q_{\mathbf{k}} = (q_1, \ldots, q_n)\right)$$

*with respect to $U$ and $V$ respectively, are strongly symplectically equivalent. Moreover, $V$ can be taken to be $Q_{\mathbf{k}}$-saturated.*

**Remark 4.19.** Compact purely elliptic orbits are leaves of the system; this should be compared with the regular case (cf. Theorem 3.31), and contrasted with the general non-degenerate case (cf. Remark 4.13 and Theorem 4.14). Furthermore, Theorem 4.18 implies that, locally near any compact purely elliptic orbit, the Hamiltonian $\mathbb{R}^n$-action descends to a Hamiltonian $\mathbb{T}^n$-action, which, again, is reminiscent of the regular case (cf. Remark 3.33). In fact, it is possible to extend the notion of regular leaf space as in Definition 3.35 to include compact, purely elliptic orbits; this gives rise to a subset of the leaf space $\mathcal{L}_{\text{lt}}$ which, in [35], is called the *locally toric* leaf space. Like the regular leaf space, it inherits an integral affine structure which, in fact, extends that on the regular leaf space; however, unlike the regular leaf space, in general, this structure makes it into a smooth manifold *with corners*. (This should be compared with the structure of orbit spaces of symplectic toric manifolds, cf. [41].) △

## 4.2 Almost-toric systems

Henceforth we restrict our attention to integrable systems with two degrees of freedom all of whose singular orbits are non-degenerate, unless otherwise stated. Motivated by notions which first appeared in [69, 73], we introduce the following family of integrable systems.

**Definition 4.20.** *An integrable system $(M, \omega, F)$ with two degrees of freedom and with compact fibers is said to be* almost-toric *if all of its singular orbits are non-degenerate without hyperbolic blocks, i.e. for any such orbit $k_h = 0$.*

The Williamson type of a singular orbit of an almost-toric system is very constrained, for it can be one of three types: $(0, 2, 0, 0)$, $(1, 1, 0, 0)$ or $(0, 0, 0, 1)$. The first two are purely elliptic and are known as *elliptic-elliptic* and *elliptic-regular* orbits, while the last is a *focus-focus* point. Furthermore,

the absence of hyperbolic blocks has important consequences when describing neighborhoods of singular orbits. First, Theorem 4.14 implies that a neighborhood of any singular point of an almost-toric system is strongly symplectically equivalent to the corresponding local model. Second, together with compactness, it ensures that all singular orbits are compact. (For a more general statement and a proof, cf. [80, Proposition 3.5]).

**Corollary 4.21.** *Any singular orbit of an almost-toric system is compact.*

**Remark 4.22.** Corollary 4.21 does not hold if hyperbolic blocks are allowed. Consider, for instance, $\big(S^2 \times \mathbb{T}^2, \omega, F = (f_1, f_2)\big)$, where $\omega = \omega_{S^2} \oplus \omega_{\mathbb{T}^2}$ is the sum of the standard symplectic forms on $S^2$ and $\mathbb{T}^2$ respectively, and $f_1 : S^2 \times \mathbb{T}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ is the pullback of the height function on $S^2$, while $f_2 : S^2 \times \mathbb{T}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ is the pullback of a Morse function on $\mathbb{T}^2$ which possesses a point of index 0, two points of index 1 and a point of index 2. It can be checked directly that all singular orbits of the integrable system $\big(S^2 \times \mathbb{T}^2, \omega, F = (f_1, f_2)\big)$ are non-degenerate, but there are elliptic-regular orbits which are not compact. $\triangle$

Corollary 4.21 implies that Theorem 4.18 can be used to provide a local normal form for neighborhoods of elliptic-regular orbits. In particular, this also shows that a purely elliptic orbit of an almost-toric system is a leaf. As a consequence, we have the following result.

**Corollary 4.23.** *If $(M, \omega, F)$ is an almost-toric system and $p \in M$ is a focus-focus point, then all singular points in the leaf containing $p$ are also focus-focus.*

Corollary 4.23 motivates the introduction of the following notion.

**Definition 4.24.** *A* focus-focus *leaf of an almost-toric system is a leaf containing a focus-focus point.*

When the fibers of an almost-toric system are connected (as in the case of semi-toric systems, cf. Theorem 5.5), we talk about focus-focus *fibers*. In what follows, we describe the topology of focus-focus leaves in almost-toric systems (cf. [4, Section 9.8.1] and [71, Section 6.3] for proofs). The starting point is the following topological statement, which hinges on compactness of the leaf.

**Lemma 4.25.** *Any focus-focus leaf of an almost-toric system contains finitely many focus-focus points.*

**Definition 4.26.** *The* multiplicity *of a focus-focus leaf $\Lambda$ is an almost-toric system $(M, \omega, F)$ is the number of focus-focus points contained in $\Lambda$.*

Thinking of a focus-focus leaf as a point in the leaf space of an almost-toric system, its multiplicity defines a natural number that can be attached to this point and is an invariant under (strong) symplectic equivalence.

To prove further properties about focus-focus leaves in an almost-toric system, we recall the local model for a focus-focus point. The integrable system under consideration is $\big(\mathbb{R}^4, \omega_0, (q_1, q_2)\big)$, where $\omega_0 = \mathrm{d}x_1 \wedge \mathrm{d}y_1 + \mathrm{d}x_2 \wedge \mathrm{d}y_2$ and $q_1 = x_1y_2 - x_2y_1$, $q_2 = x_1y_1 + x_2y_2$, and the focus-focus point is the origin. The following result, whose proof is left to reader, summarizes some important properties of this model system.

**Proposition 4.27.** *Given the above integrable system $\big(\mathbb{R}^4, \omega_0, (q_1, q_2)\big)$,*

- *the flow of $\mathcal{X}_{q_1}$ is periodic. In particular, the function $q_1$ can be thought as the moment map of an effective Hamiltonian $S^1$-action. The $S^1$-action is, up to sign, unique;*
- *the Hamiltonian $\mathbb{R}^2$-action descends to a Hamiltonian $S^1 \times \mathbb{R}$-action;*
- *any open neighborhood of the origin contains a smaller open neighborhood which is saturated with respect to the above $S^1$-action, i.e. the latter contains whole orbits of the $S^1$-action;*
- *the singular fiber $(q_1, q_2)^{-1}(0, 0)$ consists of the transversal intersection of two Lagrangian disks, which are the stable and unstable manifold for the flow of $\mathcal{X}_{q_2}$ restricted to $(q_1, q_2)^{-1}(0, 0)$.*

Using Theorem 4.14, Proposition 4.27 provides a description of the topology of a focus-focus leaf near a focus-focus point, as well as giving some information about the $S^1 \times \mathbb{R}$ action defined along the leaf. (In fact, it also provides information about the Hamiltonian action in a neighborhood of the leaf, cf. [4, Section 9.8.1].) This characterization can be used to infer further information about focus-focus leaves in almost-toric systems.

**Corollary 4.28.** *Any focus-focus leaf in an almost-toric system contains at least one regular orbit of the Hamiltonian $\mathbb{R}^2$-action. Moreover, each such orbit is diffeomorphic to $S^1 \times \mathbb{R}$.*

Finally, we can achieve a complete description of the topology of focus-focus fibers in almost-toric systems.

**Theorem 4.29.** *A focus-focus leaf of multiplicity $r \geq 1$ in an almost-toric system is homeomorphic to a torus with $r$ pinches.*

In fact, it is possible to give a 'smooth' description of focus-focus leaves, using the full strength of Proposition 4.27.

**Corollary 4.30.** *Let $\Lambda$ be a focus-focus leaf of multiplicity $r \geq 1$ in an almost-toric system. If $r = 1$, $\Lambda$ is given by an immersed Lagrangian sphere with a single double point. If $r \geq 2$, $\Lambda$ is given by a chain of $r$ Lagrangian spheres any two of which intersect transversally in a single point.*

*Proof.* The result follows from Proposition 4.27, which gives a *smooth* characterization of focus-focus fibers near a focus-focus point, since, locally, these are given by the transversal intersection of Lagrangian disks. □

**Remark 4.31.** Corollary 4.30 can be used to obtain topological *obstructions* for a symplectic manifold to support an almost-toric system with a focus-focus fiber with multiplicity $r \geq 2$ (cf. [67]). △

## 4.3 Neighborhoods of focus-focus fibers

Theorem 4.29 and Corollary 4.30 provide complete topological and differentiable descriptions of focus-focus leaves in almost-toric systems, showing that they are completely determined by their multiplicities. A natural question to ask is whether, given two focus-focus leaves in almost-toric systems with equal multiplicity, foliated neighborhoods of the two are necessarily (strongly) symplectically equivalent. The aim of this section is to present a proof, in the case of multiplicity equal to 1, that this is *not* the case: a *symplectic* invariant arises, as first shown in [72].

Throughout this section, an almost-toric system $(M, \omega, F)$ satisfies the following hypotheses:

- All fibers are connected;
- There is only one singular fiber, $F^{-1}(0,0)$, which is of focus-focus type and has multiplicity 1.

Observe that, under the above hypotheses, the map $F : M \to \mathbb{R}^2$ is necessarily proper onto its image; this is a consequence of [52, Theorem 3.3]. Using this topological fact, the leaf space $\mathcal{L}$ of such an integrable system can be identified topologically with the moment map image $F(M)$ (cf. [35]).

Fix such an integrable system $(M, \omega, F)$ and let $p \in F^{-1}(0,0)$ denote the focus-focus point. Let $U \subset M$ be the open neighborhood of $p$ on which the system is strongly symplectically equivalent to the local model of a singular point of focus-focus type. Unraveling the definitions and using connectedness of the fibers of $F$ as well as Proposition 4.27, this means that there exists a smooth map $g : F(U) \to \mathbb{R}^2$ which is a diffeomorphism onto its image with $g(0,0) = (0,0)$ such that the first component of

$$g \circ F : \left(F^{-1}\left(F(U)\right), \omega|_{F^{-1}(F(U))}\right) \to \mathbb{R}^2$$

is the moment map of an effective Hamiltonian $S^1$-action. Therefore, since $F^{-1}\left(F(U)\right)$ is an open neighborhood of $F^{-1}(0,0)$, it may be assumed, without loss of generality, that the open neighborhood $U$ intersects all fibers of $F$ and that the first component of $F = (f_1, f_2)$ is the moment map of an effective Hamiltonian $S^1$-action. Moreover, to simplify notation, we assume that $F(M) = \mathbb{R}^2$.

The first aim of this section is to calculate the *bundle of periods* associated to the subsystem of $(M, \omega, F)$ relative to $F^{-1}\left(\mathbb{R}^2 \smallsetminus \{(0,0)\}\right)$ (cf. Remark 3.33). Looking at the proof of Theorem 3.31, one way to obtain this bundle (locally) is to fix a (local) Lagrangian section $\sigma$ and calculate which closed 1-forms satisfy $\phi_\alpha^1 \circ \sigma = \sigma$, where $\phi_\alpha^t$ is the flow at time $t$ of the vector field $\mathcal{X}_\alpha$[5]. With the above assumptions, it is clear that $\mathcal{X}_{f_1}$ has periodic flow of period 1; thus, if $\Sigma \to \mathbb{R}^2 \smallsetminus \{(0,0)\}$ denotes the period bundle and $(a, b)$ denote the standard coordinates on $\mathbb{R}^2$, we have that $\mathbb{Z}\langle \mathrm{d}a \rangle \subset \Sigma$ and $\mathrm{d}a$ is primitive, *i.e.* for each point $c \in \mathbb{R}^2 \smallsetminus \{(0,0)\}$, the quotient $\Sigma_c / \mathbb{Z}\langle \mathrm{d}_c a \rangle$ has no torsion. To complete the calculation of $\Sigma$, we prove another important consequence of Theorem 4.14.

**Corollary 4.32.** *Let $\left(\mathbb{R}^4, \omega_0, (q_1, q_2)\right)$ denote the local model for focus-focus points. Then there exist smooth Lagrangian sections $\sigma_s, \sigma_u : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}^4$ with the property that $\sigma_s(0,0)$ (respectively $\sigma_u(0,0)$) intersects the stable (respectively unstable) manifold of the flow of $\mathcal{X}_{q_2}$.*

*Proof.* Fix the following complex coordinates on $\mathbb{R}^4 \cong \mathbb{C}^2$ and on $\mathbb{R}^2 \cong \mathbb{C}$: $z_1 := x_1 + ix_2$, $z_2 = y_2 + iy_1$, $w = a + ib$. Then the map $(q_1, q_2)$ can be written as $(z_1, z_2) \mapsto z_1 z_2$, *i.e.* as a complex hyperbolic map. It can be checked that the stable and unstable manifolds of the flow of $\mathcal{X}_{q_2}$ are given by $\{z_1 = 0\}$ and $\{z_2 = 0\}$. Fix $\epsilon > 0$ and consider the sections $\sigma_s(w) := \left(\frac{w}{\epsilon}, \epsilon\right)$ and $\sigma_u(w) := \left(\epsilon, \frac{w}{\epsilon}\right)$. These sections are the required ones. □

[5]There is a slight abuse of notation here: $\alpha$ is not necessarily exact, but it can be written as a linear combination of exact forms.

Going back to the almost-toric system $(M, \omega, F)$, Corollary 4.32 implies that there exist smooth Lagrangian sections $\sigma_s, \sigma_u : \mathbb{R}^2 \to M$ such that $\sigma_s(0,0)$ and $\sigma_u(0,0)$ 'lie on opposite sides of' the focus-focus point $p$. These sections can help us to determine $\Sigma$ using the following trick (cf. [72]). To find a generator of $\Sigma$ which is linearly independent of $\mathrm{d}a$, it suffices to solve the equation $\phi^1_\alpha \circ \sigma_u = \sigma_u$ modulo $\mathbb{Z}\langle \mathrm{d}a \rangle$. To this end, seeing as the action of $T^*\left(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{(0,0)\}\right)$ is by abelian Lie groups, we can write any 1-form as above as $\alpha = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1$, where $\alpha_0$ is the solution to $\phi^1_{\alpha_0} \circ \sigma_u = \sigma_s$ *within* the open neighborhood $U$, while $\alpha_1$ is the solution to $\phi^1_{\alpha_1} \circ \sigma_s = \sigma_u$ with the property that the flow of $\mathcal{X}_{\alpha_1}$ leaves $U$. Using the complex coordinates of the proof of Corollary 4.32, it can be checked that, modulo $\mathbb{Z}\langle \mathrm{d}a \rangle$,

$$\alpha_0 := \frac{1}{2\pi} \mathrm{Im}\left(\mathrm{d}\left(w \log w - w\right)\right) - 2 \ln \epsilon \mathrm{d}b, \tag{14}$$

where Im denotes the imaginary part and log is any determination of the complex logarithm. (The above expression only makes sense modulo $\mathbb{Z}\langle \mathrm{d}a \rangle$!) On the other hand, since $\sigma_u, \sigma_s$ are smooth Lagrangian sections, we know that $\alpha_1$ is a closed form (modulo $\mathbb{Z}\langle \mathrm{d}a \rangle$) on $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{(0,0)\}$. However, the equation $\phi^1_{\alpha_1} \circ \sigma_s = \sigma_u$ can be solved also at $(0,0)$, as the complement of a focus-focus point in a focus-focus fiber of multiplicity one is a cylinder (cf. Theorem 4.29). This means that there exists a closed form on $\mathbb{R}^2$ which, when restricted to $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{(0,0)\}$, equals $\alpha_1$; thus $\alpha_1$ is exact. This discussion proves the following result (cf. [72, Proposition 3.1]).

**Lemma 4.33.** *The bundle of periods associated to an almost-toric system $(M, \omega, F)$ as above is given by*

$$\Sigma := \mathbb{Z}\left\langle \mathrm{d}a, \frac{1}{2\pi} \mathrm{Im}\left(\mathrm{d}\left(w \log w - w\right)\right) + \mathrm{d}h \right\rangle, \tag{15}$$

*where* log *is any determination of the complex logarithm and $h : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth function.*

It is important to observe that, while the above expression for $\Sigma$ makes sense, the bundle $\Sigma \to \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{(0,0)\}$ is *not trivial*, for the function log is multivalued. This is what gives rise to non-trivial Hamiltonian monodromy in the presence of focus-focus fibers (cf. [81]); using Lemma 4.33, this can be formulated as follows. Let $l := \left\{(a,b) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid a = 0, b \geq 0\right\}$ and let log be a branch of the complex logarithm defined on $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus l$ so that the difference between the induced argument function on the 'right' and 'left' of $l$ (*i.e.* if $a > 0$ or $a < 0$ respectively) is $2\pi$. Moreover, set $\beta_1 := \mathrm{d}a$, $\beta_2 := \frac{1}{2\pi} \mathrm{Im}\left(\mathrm{d}\left(w \log w - w\right)\right) + \mathrm{d}h$.

**Corollary 4.34** (Linear holonomy of a focus-focus fiber with multiplicity 1)**.** *For any $y > 0$, the following equality holds*

$$\lim_{\substack{(x,y)\to(0,y)\\ x>0}} \begin{pmatrix}\beta_1(x,y)\\ \beta_2(x,y)\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix}1 & 0\\ 1 & 1\end{pmatrix} \lim_{\substack{(x,y)\to(0,y)\\ x<0}} \begin{pmatrix}\beta_1(x,y)\\ \beta_2(x,y)\end{pmatrix}. \tag{16}$$

*Proof.* Fix $y > 0$. Since $\beta_1$ is globally defined on $\mathbb{R}^2$, it follows that

$$\lim_{\substack{(x,y)\to(0,y)\\ x>0}} \beta_1(x,y) = \lim_{\substack{(x,y)\to(0,y)\\ x<0}} \beta_1(x,y).$$

On the other hand, with the above choice of complex logarithm, have that

$$\lim_{\substack{(x,y)\to(0,y)\\ x>0}} \beta_2(x,y) - \lim_{\substack{(x,y)\to(0,y)\\ x<0}} \beta_2(x,y) = \beta_1(0,y);$$

this uses the fact that the smooth function $h$ in Lemma 4.33 is continuous at the origin. This completes the proof. □

**Remark 4.35.** Hamiltonian monodromy refers to non-triviality of the bundle of first homology groups of the fibers (cf. [22, 81]); this bundle is dual to the bundle of periods via equation (10). △

Lemma 4.33 can be used to classify *germs* of neighborhoods of focus-focus fibers of multiplicity 1 in almost-toric systems satisfying the above hypotheses (cf. [72, Theorem 2.1]). To this end, observe that Lemma 4.33 associates to any such almost-toric system the family of smooth functions $h_{k,c} := h + ka + c : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$, where $h : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth function as in Lemma 4.33 with $h(0,0) = 0$ and $\frac{\partial h}{\partial a}(0,0) \in [0,1[$, $a : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ denotes projection onto the first coordinate, and $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$. Henceforth, we choose the representative $h = h_{0,0}$, which is uniquely determined by the above properties. The following result, presented below without proof, describes the moduli space of germs of neighborhoods of focus-focus fibers of multiplicity 1 in almost-toric systems satisfying the above hypotheses.

**Theorem 4.36** ([72])**.**

- *Let $(M,\omega,F)$, $(M',\omega',F')$ be almost-toric systems satisfying the above hypotheses and let $h, h'$ be the associated smooth functions as in Lemma 4.33. Then $(M,\omega,F)$, $(M',\omega',F')$ are strongly symplectically equivalent in a neighborhood of the focus-focus fiber if and only if the Taylor series of $h, h'$ at the origin are equal;*

- *Let $\mathbb{R}[\![X,Y]\!]_0$ denote the space of formal power series in the variables $X$ and $Y$ with vanishing constant coefficient and whose $X$ coefficient is contained in $[0,1[$. Then for any $T \in \mathbb{R}[\![X,Y]\!]_0$, there exists an almost-toric system satisfying the above hypotheses whose associated smooth function $h$ has Taylor series at the origin equal to $T$.*

**Remark 4.37.** The analogue of Theorem 4.36 for focus-focus fibers with higher multiplicity is sketched in [72, Section 7]; it is worthwhile remarking that the classification is expected to be more involved in this case, see [56]. △

**Definition 4.38.** *Given an almost-toric system $(M,\omega,F)$ satisfying the above hypotheses, the Taylor series at the origin of the associated smooth function $h$ is called the* Taylor series invariant *of the germ of $(M,\omega,F)$ at the focus-focus fiber.*

# 5 Semi-toric systems

The aim of this section is to describe properties of *semi-toric* systems, which have been intensively studied in the last few years from both the classical and quantum perspectives (cf. [33, 35, 44, 57, 58, 59, 73] amongst others). What is surprising is that, while mathematically they are, in some sense, the simplest non-trivial family of almost-toric systems admitting focus-focus leaves, there are several physical systems which can be modeled using semi-toric systems (cf. [16, 37, 63]).

## 5.1 Definition, Examples and First properties

We begin with introducing semi-toric systems, first defined in [73].

**Definition 5.1.** *An integrable system $(M,\omega,F=(J,H))$ is said to be* semi-toric *if*

*(S1) all its singular orbits are non-degenerate without hyperbolic blocks;*

*(S2) the first component $J$ is a proper moment map of an effective Hamiltonian $S^1$-action.*

Properness of $J$ above implies that of $F$, thus making semi-toric systems into examples of almost-toric ones (cf. Definition 4.20).

**Example 5.2.** Four dimensional toric integrable systems on closed manifolds (cf. Example 3.16) are examples of semi-toric systems without focus-focus leaves. More generally, four-dimensional toric integrable systems whose moment map has a proper first component are semi-toric.

**Example 5.3.** For all but two values of the parameter $t$ in the family of integrable systems given by the coupled angular momenta on $S^2 \times S^2$ (cf. Example 3.15), the corresponding integrable systems are semi-toric (cf. [73, Example 6.1]). This family of examples can be adapted to construct examples of semi-toric systems on non-compact manifolds by linearizing one of the spheres at one of the poles: this gives rise to the so-called coupled spin oscillator on $S^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2$ (cf. [73, Example 6.2]).

**Remark 5.4.** Let $(M, \omega, F = (J, H))$ be a semi-toric system; the triple $(M, \omega, J)$ obtained by 'forgetting' $H$ encodes an effective Hamiltonian $S^1$-action on $(M, \omega)$ one of whose moment maps $J : (M, \omega) \to \mathbb{R}$ is proper. We say that $(M, \omega, J)$ *underlies* $(M, \omega, F = (J, H))$. In this case, the fibers of $J$ are connected (cf. [1, 29, 45]); moreover, if $(M, \omega)$ is closed, a classification of such triples, known as *Hamiltonian $S^1$-spaces* is achieved in [40]. △

The first fundamental result in the study of semi-toric system is a *connectedness* result for the fibers of its moment map: this can be seen as a generalization of connectedness of the fibers of (four-dimensional) symplectic toric manifolds whose moment maps are proper (cf. [1, 29, 45]). Its proof, which is omitted here, uses connectedness of the fibers of the first component (cf. Remark 5.4), together with the control on the singular fibers which arises from restricting the types of singular orbits that can arise (cf. property (S1) in Definition 5.1).

**Theorem 5.5** (Theorem 3.4 in [73])**.** *The fibers of a semi-toric system are connected.*

An immediate consequence of Theorem 5.5 is that the leaf space of a semi-toric system is homeomorphic to its moment map image endowed with the subset topology (cf. [35]). In fact, the moment map image of a semi-toric system and the associated *bifurcation diagram* (*i.e.* the set of singular values of the moment map) satisfy the following properties (cf. [73, Proposition 2.9 and Theorem 3.4]). Let $(M, \omega, F)$ be a semi-toric system and set $B = F(M)$; then:

- $B$ is contractible;
- $\partial B \subset B$ consists of the image of purely elliptic orbits;

- the set of *focus-focus values*, *i.e.* the image of focus-focus fibers, is discrete in $B$ and, hence, countable. Denote it by $B_{\mathrm{ff}} := \{c_i\}_{i\in I}$;
- the subset of $B_{\mathrm{reg}} \subset B$ consisting of regular values equals $\mathrm{Int}(B) \setminus B_{\mathrm{ff}}$. This implies that $B_{\mathrm{lt}}$, the locally toric leaf space of $(M, \omega, F)$ equals $B \setminus B_{\mathrm{ff}}$.

In fact, slightly more is true (cf. [73, Corollary 5.10] for a slightly different argument).

**Corollary 5.6.** *Let $(M, \omega, F)$ be a semi-toric system and let $B_{\mathrm{ff}}$ denote its set of focus-focus values. Then the cardinality of $B_{\mathrm{ff}}$ is finite.*

*Sketch of proof.* The idea is to use the *Duistermaat-Heckman* measure associated to the $S^1$-action one of whose moment map is $J$ (cf. [24]). This is a non-negative function whose value at a point $x \in J(M)$ is the symplectic volume of the symplectic reduction $J^{-1}(x)/S^1$; in this case, it turns out to be a piecewise linear function, whose changes in slope depend on isolated singular points of the $S^1$-action and their *isotropy weights*, *i.e.* a pair of coprime integers which can be naturally associated to the linearized $S^1$-action near an isolated fixed point (cf. [28, Section 3] and [40, Lemma 2.12]). The result follows by observing that the isotropy weights of the $S^1$-action at the focus-focus points need be $\pm 1$ (cf. [82, Theorem 1.2]), and the formula of [28, Section 3] and [40, Lemma 2.12] for the Duistermaat-Heckman function implies that there can be at most finitely many such isolated fixed points. □

The above properties of semi-toric systems would justify the use of strong symplectic equivalence as 'the' notion of equivalence for semi-toric systems; however, the property of being semi-toric is *not* invariant under such isomorphisms. Seeing as the $S^1$-action plays an important role in establishing the basic properties of semi-toric systems, the following stricter notion of equivalence is considered.

**Definition 5.7.** *Two semi-toric systems $(M_1, \omega_1, F_1)$, $(M_2, \omega_2, F_2)$ are said to be* isomorphic *if they are strongly symplectically equivalent via a pair $(\varphi, g)$, where $g(x, y) = \big(x, g^{(2)}(x, y)\big)$ for some smooth function $g^{(2)}$ defined on $B_1$.*

**Remark 5.8.** The above condition on the diffeomorphism $g : B_1 \to B_2$ implies that $\frac{\partial g^{(2)}}{\partial y} \neq 0$ on $B_1$. While Definition 5.7 seems to agree with the notion of isomorphism of semi-toric systems introduced in [57, 58], in those works the slightly stronger condition that $\frac{\partial g^{(2)}}{\partial y} > 0$ is used implicitly (cf. [60] and [44, Definition 2.1]). △

## 5.2 Invariants of semi-toric systems

The aim of this section is to construct data associate to a semi-toric system, which is invariant under isomorphisms and can therefore be used to classify these systems (cf. Theorem 5.43). Henceforth, any semi-toric system $(M, \omega, F = (J, H))$ is assumed to satisfy the following extra condition:

(S3) There is at most one focus-focus point on any given level set of the function $J$.

**Remark 5.9.** Property (S3) is equivalent to demanding that any focus-focus fiber has multiplicity 1 and that any level set of $J$ contains at most one focus-focus fiber. Many works in the literature require the former (however, see [55, 56, 72, 73] for results without this restriction); in fact, [80] states that this condition is 'generic'. On the other hand, imposing the latter merely simplifies the exposition below. △

In what follows, fix a semi-toric system $(M, \omega, F)$ whose moment map image is denoted by $B$ and whose set of focus-focus values is denoted by $B_{\text{ff}}$. By Corollary 5.6, there exists a non-negative integer $m_{\text{ff}} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ which equals the cardinality of $B_{\text{ff}}$. Let $c_1 = (x_1, y_1), \ldots, c_{m_{\text{ff}}} = (x_{m_{\text{ff}}}, y_{m_{\text{ff}}})$ denote the elements of $B_{\text{ff}}$ ordered so that $i < j$ implies $x_i < x_j$.

### 5.2.1 The number of focus-focus values and the Taylor series invariant

The cardinality $m_{\text{ff}}$ of $B_{\text{ff}}$ is the simplest datum that can be associated to $(M, \omega, F = (J, H))$ and is invariant under isomorphism; it is henceforth referred to as the *number of focus-focus points*.

The next invariant of $(M, \omega, F)$ comes from the Taylor series invariant of neighborhoods of focus-focus fibers constructed in Section 4.38. For each $i = 1, \ldots, m_{\text{ff}}$, let $V_i \subset \text{Int}\,(B)$ be an open neighborhood of $c_i$ which contains precisely one singular value of $F$. Then the subsystem of $(M, \omega, F)$ relative to $F^{-1}(V_i)$ is an almost-toric system satisfying the assumptions of Section 4.3. Thus we can associate to it a smooth function $h_i$ defined near the origin whose Taylor series $T_i \in \mathbb{R}[\![X, Y]\!]_0$ is an invariant of the germ of the integrable system near $F^{-1}(c_i)$, *i.e.* it does not depend on the open neighborhood $V_i$.

**Definition 5.10.** *For each $i = 1, \ldots, m_{\text{ff}}$, the formal power series $T_i \in \mathbb{R}[\![X, Y]\!]_0$ is said to be the* Taylor series invariant *at $c_i$ of $(M, \omega, F)$, while the*

*ordered collection* $\mathbf{T} := (T_i, \dots, T_{m_{\mathrm{ff}}}) \in (\mathbb{R}[\![X, Y]\!]_0)^{m_{\mathrm{ff}}}$ *is called the* Taylor series invariant *of* $(M, \omega, F)$.

**Corollary 5.11.** *If two semi-toric systems are isomorphic, their Taylor series invariants are equal.*

### 5.2.2 Cartographic invariant

The last remaining invariant of semi-toric systems generalizes the moment map image for (four dimensional) toric integrable systems with proper moment map (cf. [41, Proposition 6.3]). Loosely speaking, this invariant encodes the integral affine structure $\mathcal{A}$ on the locally toric leaf space $B_{\mathrm{lt}} = B \setminus B_{\mathrm{ff}} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ (cf. Corollary 3.39 and Remark 4.19). To make the above precise, we need to recall the notion of *developing map* of an (integral) affine structure[6] (cf. [2] for further details).

#### Intermezzo: developing maps for (integral) affine manifolds

Let $(N, \mathcal{A})$ be an $n$-dimensional integral affine manifold and let $\tilde{N}$ denote its universal cover. The universal covering map $q : \tilde{N} \to N$ induces an integral affine structure $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ on $\tilde{N}$ by pulling back $\mathcal{A}$. Upon a choice of basepoint $x_0 \in N$ and of an integral affine coordinate chart $\chi_0$ defined near $x_0$, there is a local diffeomorphism $\mathrm{dev}_{x_0,\chi_0} : \tilde{N} \to \mathbb{R}^n$ which is a *global* integral affine coordinate chart for $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ (cf. [2] for the explicit construction).

**Definition 5.12.** *The map* $\mathrm{dev}_{x_0,\chi_0} : \tilde{N} \to \mathbb{R}^n$ *is called the* developing map *of* $(N, \mathcal{A})$ *(relative to the choices of* $x_0$ *and of* $\chi_0$*).*

**Remark 5.13.** If $x_0' \in N$ and $\chi_0'$ are different choices of basepoint and of integral affine coordinate map respectively, then there exists an element $\rho \in \mathrm{AGL}(n; \mathbb{Z})$ such that $\mathrm{dev}_{x_0',\chi_0'} = \rho \circ \mathrm{dev}_{x_0,\chi_0}$. Conversely, for any $\rho \in \mathrm{AGL}(n; \mathbb{Z})$, the map $\rho \circ \mathrm{dev}_{x_0,\chi_0}$ is a developing map. △

Henceforth, fix choices $x_0 \in N$ and $\chi_0$ and, to simplify notation, denote the resulting developing map by dev. The action of the fundamental group $\pi_1(N) = \pi_1(N, x_0)$ on $\tilde{N}$ by deck transformations is via integral affine diffeomorphisms, *i.e.* there is a group homomorphism $\mathfrak{a} : \pi_1(N) \to \mathrm{AGL}(n; \mathbb{Z})$

[6] The discussion holds *mutatis mutandis* in the more general context of $(G, X)$-structures in the sense of [66].

which, for any $[\gamma] \in \pi_1(N)$, makes the following diagram commute

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \tilde{N} & \xrightarrow{\text{dev}} & \mathbb{R}^n \\ {\scriptstyle \cdot[\gamma]}\downarrow & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle \mathfrak{a}([\gamma])} \\ \tilde{N} & \xrightarrow[\text{dev}]{} & \mathbb{R}^n, \end{array}$$

where $\cdot[\gamma] : \tilde{N} \to \tilde{N}$ denotes the diffeomorphism induced by acting by $[\gamma]$.

**Definition 5.14.** *The homomorphism* $\mathfrak{a} : \pi_1(N) \to \mathrm{AGL}(n;\mathbb{Z})$ *is the* affine holonomy *of* $(N, \mathcal{A})$. *Its composite with the natural projection* $\mathrm{Lin} : \mathrm{AGL}(n;\mathbb{Z}) \to \mathrm{GL}(n;\mathbb{Z})$ *is denoted by* $\mathfrak{l} : \pi_1(N) \to \mathrm{GL}(n;\mathbb{Z})$ *and is the* linear holonomy *of* $(N, \mathcal{A})$.

**Example 5.15.** Unraveling the above constructions and the proof of Corollary 4.34, we obtain that equation (16) is nothing but the calculation of the linear holonomy of the integral affine structure induced by an almost-toric system as in Section 4.3 near a focus-focus value. Exactness of the symplectic form in a neighborhood of the focus-focus fiber implies, in fact, that the linear and affine holonomies coincide for such integral affine structures.

**Remark 5.16.** If $(N, \mathcal{A})$ is an $n$-dimensional integral affine manifold with corners, the above discussion constructs a developing map and an affine holonomy representation for $(N, \mathcal{A})$. The types of integral affine manifolds with corners that we deal with when studying semi-toric systems (or, more generally, almost-toric systems) are, in fact, special, for the facets and corners satisfy a *unimodularity* condition (cf. Definition 5.17 below). This condition can be described as follows: the image of any codimension $k = 1, 2$ face of $\tilde{N}$ under the developing map is the intersection of $k$ linear hyperplanes in $\mathbb{R}^2$ whose normals can be chosen to span a $k$-dimensional unimodular sublattice of $\mathbb{Z}^2$, *i.e.* the quotient of $\mathbb{Z}^2$ by the lattice has no torsion. This is a consequence of Theorem 4.18 which provides integral affine coordinate maps near the boundary of the locally toric leaf space (cf. Remark 4.19). △

### The cartographic invariant in the case $m_{\mathrm{ff}} = 0$

Going back to the semi-toric system $(M, \omega, F)$, the aim is to encode the integral affine structure $\mathcal{A}$ on $B_{\mathrm{lt}}$; intuitively, the idea is to construct a map defined on the whole of $B$ which plays the role of the developing map for the '*singular* integral affine structure on $B$' and whose image satisfies familiar properties, which are recalled below.

**Definition 5.17.** *A* polygon *is a closed subset of* $\mathbb{R}^2$ *whose boundary is a piece-wise linear curve with finitely many vertices contained in any compact subset of* $\mathbb{R}^2$*. Each linear piece of the boundary is called an* edge*, while a* vertex *is a point at which the boundary fails to be differentiable. A polygon is said to be*

- convex *if it is the convex hull of isolated points in* $\mathbb{R}^2$*;*
- simple *if there are exactly two edges incident to any vertex;*
- rational *if the slope of any edge is a rational number.*

*A vertex* $v$ *of a simple, rational polygon is said to be* smooth *(or* unimodular*) if the normal vectors to the edges incident to* $v$*, each chosen so that its components are coprime, generate* $\mathbb{Z}^2$*. A simple, rational polygon is said to be* smooth *(or* unimodular*) if all its vertices are. The set of convex, simple, rational (and smooth) polygons is denoted by* $\mathrm{RPol}\left(\mathbb{R}^2\right)$ *(respectively* $\mathrm{DPol}\left(\mathbb{R}^2\right)$*).*

**Remark 5.18.** Clearly, the following chain of inclusions holds $\mathrm{DPol}\left(\mathbb{R}^2\right) \subset \mathrm{RPol}\left(\mathbb{R}^2\right) \subset \mathrm{Pol}\left(\mathbb{R}^2\right)$, where $\mathrm{Pol}\left(\mathbb{R}^2\right)$ is the set of all polygons in $\mathbb{R}^2$. Moreover, the natural $\mathrm{AGL}\left(2;\mathbb{Z}\right)$-action on $\mathbb{R}^2$ defines a $\mathrm{AGL}\left(2;\mathbb{Z}\right)$-action on $\mathrm{Pol}\left(\mathbb{R}^2\right)$ which leaves both $\mathrm{DPol}\left(\mathbb{R}^2\right)$ and $\mathrm{RPol}\left(\mathbb{R}^2\right)$ invariant. △

Suppose first that $m_{\mathrm{ff}} = 0$; then the following result holds.

**Proposition 5.19.** *Let* $(M, \omega, F = (J, H))$ *be a semi-toric system with* $m_{\mathrm{ff}} = 0$*. There exists a smooth map* $f : B = F(M) \to \mathbb{R}^2$ *of the form* $f(x, y) := \left(x, f^{(2)}(x, y)\right)$*, where* $f^{(2)} : B \to \mathbb{R}$ *is a smooth function, such that*

- $f$ *is a diffeomorphism onto its image;*
- *the composite* $f \circ F : (M, \omega) \to \mathbb{R}^2$ *is the moment map of an effective Hamiltonian* $\mathbb{T}^2$*-action*[7]*.*

*In particular,* $f(B)$ *is a convex, rational, simple, smooth polygon, i.e.* $f(B) \in \mathrm{DPol}\left(\mathbb{R}^2\right)$*.*

*Sketch of proof.* The idea is to choose an appropriate developing map for the integral affine manifold $(B, \mathcal{A})$. Since $B$ is contractible, upon a choice of basepoint and integral affine coordinate map, there exists a developing map $\mathrm{dev} : B \to \mathbb{R}^2$. By definition of the integral affine structure on $B$ (cf.

[7] Throughout we fix an identification $\mathrm{Lie}\left(\mathbb{T}^2\right) \cong \mathbb{R}^2$.

Corollary 3.39 and Remark 4.19) and by property (S2), it is possible to fix the above choices so that $\mathrm{dev}(x,y) = \left(x, \mathrm{dev}^{(2)}(x,y)\right)$. Set $f := \mathrm{dev}$; since dev is a local diffeomorphism, the above form implies that dev is injective. This proves the first item. By definition of the integral affine structure $\mathcal{A}$, $f \circ F$ is the moment map of an effective Hamiltonian $\mathbb{T}^2$-action. Moreover, the first component of $f \circ F$ is equal to $J$, which is proper by assumption; therefore $f \circ F$ is proper, which implies that $f(B)$ is a convex, rational, simple, smooth polygon by [45, Theorem 1.1] and [20]. □

**Definition 5.20.** *Given a semi-toric system $(M, \omega, F)$ with $m_{\mathrm{ff}} = 0$, any map $f : B \to \mathbb{R}^2$ as in Proposition 5.19 is said to be a* cartographic diffeomorphism.

**Remark 5.21.** A consequence of Proposition 5.19 is that any semi-toric system without focus-focus points is isomorphic to a toric integrable system. △

**Definition 5.22.** *Given a semi-toric system $(M, \omega, F)$ with $m_{\mathrm{ff}} = 0$ and a cartographic homeomorphism $f$, the* decorated semi-toric polygon associated to $f$ *is the pair*

$$(\mathrm{sgn}(f), f(B)) \in \mathbb{Z}/2 \times \mathrm{DPol}\left(\mathbb{R}^2\right),$$

*where* $\mathrm{sgn}(f) := \mathrm{sgn}\left(\frac{\partial f^{(2)}}{\partial y}\right)$ *is called the* sign[8] *of $f$.*

The cartographic invariant of $(M, \omega, F)$ with $m_{\mathrm{ff}} = 0$ is the collection of *all* decorated semi-toric polygons of *all* semi-toric systems isomorphic to $(M, \omega, F)$. In fact, these can be described in terms of some group actions; to this end, we introduce the subgroup of $\mathrm{AGL}(2;\mathbb{Z})$ which preserves vertical lines and denote it by $\mathcal{V}$. Combining Remark 5.13 with the proof of Proposition 5.19, we obtain the following characterization.

**Corollary 5.23.** *Let $(M, \omega, F)$ be a semi-toric system with $m_{\mathrm{ff}} = 0$, and let $f : B \to \mathbb{R}^2$ be a cartographic homeomorphism. Then $f' : B \to \mathbb{R}^2$ is a cartographic diffeomorphism if and only if there exists $\rho \in \mathcal{V}$ such that $f' = \rho \circ f$.*

There is a natural action of $\mathbb{Z}/2 \times \mathcal{V}$ on $\mathbb{Z}/2 \times \mathrm{DPol}\left(\mathbb{R}^2\right)$, given by

$$(\zeta, H) \cdot (\eta, \Delta) := (\zeta \mathrm{sgn}(H)\, \eta, H(\Delta)), \tag{17}$$

where $\mathrm{sgn}(H) := \det(\mathrm{Lin}(H))$, and $\mathrm{Lin} : \mathrm{AGL}(2;\mathbb{Z}) \to \mathrm{GL}(2;\mathbb{Z})$ is the standard projection.

[8] This quantity is well-defined by the special form of $f$.

**Definition 5.24.** *Let $(M, \omega, F)$ be a semi-toric system with $m_{\mathrm{ff}} = 0$. The $\mathbb{Z}/2 \times \mathcal{V}$-orbit of the decorated semi-toric polygon associated to any of its cartographic homeomorphisms is called the* cartographic invariant *of $(M, \omega, F)$.*

### Cartographic homeomorphisms in the case $m_{\mathrm{ff}} > 0$

Our next aim is to generalize Proposition 5.19 to the case $m_{\mathrm{ff}} \geq 1$. Henceforth, fix $m_{\mathrm{ff}} > 0$, which implies that $B_{\mathrm{lt}}$ is not simply connected; the main insight of [73] (which also appears, with fewer details, in [69]) is that, by choosing a suitable open, simply connected subset of $B_{\mathrm{lt}}$, it is possible to define a homeomorphism of $B$ onto its image which restricts to a developing map for the above chosen simply connected subset of $B_{\mathrm{lt}}$! The idea behind constructing these simply connected subsets comes from an understanding of the affine holonomy of the integral affine structure near focus-focus fibers (cf. Corollary 4.34 and Example 5.15), which, in suitable coordinates, leaves a vertical line invariant.

We show how to construct these subsets. For each $i = 1, \ldots, m_{\mathrm{ff}}$, choose a sign $\epsilon_i \in \{+1, -1\}$; this choice is henceforth encoded in the vector $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} = (\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_{m_{\mathrm{ff}}}) \in \{+1, -1\}^{m_{\mathrm{ff}}}$. For each $i = 1, \ldots, m_{\mathrm{ff}}$, consider the *(vertical) $\epsilon_i$-cut at $c_i$*,

$$l^{\epsilon_i} := \{(x, y) \in B \mid x = x_i,\, \epsilon_i y \geq \epsilon_i y_i\}\,,$$

and set $l^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} := \bigcup_{i=1}^{m_{\mathrm{ff}}} l^{\epsilon_i}$, which denotes the union of all the cuts associated to $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$. The following result, stated below without proof, characterizes the complement of the cuts.

**Lemma 5.25.** *For any $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \in \{+1, -1\}^{m_{\mathrm{ff}}}$, the complement of the cuts $B \setminus l^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}$ is open and dense in $B$, and is simply connected.*

For any $(\mathsf{x}, \mathsf{y}) \in B_{\mathrm{lt}}$ and any choice $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \in \{+1, -1\}^{m_{\mathrm{ff}}}$, define

$$j_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}(\mathsf{x}, \mathsf{y}) := \sum_{\{i=1,\ldots,m_{\mathrm{ff}} \mid (\mathsf{x},\mathsf{y}) \in l^{\epsilon_i}\}} \epsilon_i,$$

where the convention is that, if $(\mathsf{x}, \mathsf{y}) \in B \setminus l^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}$, then $j_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}(\mathsf{x}, \mathsf{y}) = 0$. The next result, whose proof is only sketched, establishes the existence of the required 'singular' developing maps, thus generalizing Proposition 5.19 (cf. [55, 73] for details).

**Theorem 5.26** (Theorem 3.8 in [73])**.** *Let $(M, \omega, F)$ be a semi-toric system with $m_{\mathrm{ff}} > 0$. For any $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \in \{+1, -1\}^{m_{\mathrm{ff}}}$, there exists $f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} : B \to \mathbb{R}^2$ of the form $f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}(x, y) := \left(x, f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}^{(2)}(x, y)\right)$ such that*

- $f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}|_{B\setminus l^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}}$ *is a developing map for the restriction of* $\mathcal{A}$ *to* $B \setminus l^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}$*;*
- $f$ *is a homeomorphism onto its image;*
- *for any* $(\mathsf{x},\mathsf{y}) \in B_{\mathrm{lt}}$*,*

$$\lim_{\substack{(x,y)\to(\mathsf{x},\mathsf{y})\\ x<\mathsf{x}}} \mathrm{d}f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}(x,y) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \operatorname{sgn}(f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}})\, j_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}(\mathsf{x},\mathsf{y}) & 1 \end{pmatrix} \lim_{\substack{(x,y)\to(\mathsf{x},\mathsf{y})\\ x>\mathsf{x}}} \mathrm{d}f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}(x,y), \tag{18}$$

*where* $\operatorname{sgn}(f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}})$ *equals the sign of* $\frac{\partial f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}^{(2)}}{\partial y}$ *(wherever the latter is defined).*

*In particular,* $f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}(B)$ *is a convex, rational, simple polygon, i.e.* $f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}(B) \in \mathrm{RPol}\left(\mathbb{R}^2\right)$*. Finally,* $f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}$ *is unique up to composition on the left by an element of* $\mathcal{V}$*.*

*Sketch of proof.* Fix $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \in \{+1,-1\}^{m_{\mathrm{ff}}}$, which, in turn, fixes the vertical cuts. Since $B \setminus l^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}$ is open in $B_{\mathrm{lt}}$, it inherits an integral affine structure; since it is simply connected, this integral affine structure can be developed. Using the arguments of the proof of Proposition 5.19, the developing map can be taken to be of the form $(x,y) \mapsto (x, a(x,y))$ for some smooth function $a$. The idea is to show that the above map extends to a continuous map on $B$ (which is unique, since $B \setminus l^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}$ is dense), which is denoted by $f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}$; to prove that $f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}$ exists an understanding of the integral affine structure near the focus-focus values is needed (cf. Lemma 4.33, as well as [73, Step 4 of the proof of Theorem 3.8] and [55, Step 4 of the proof of Theorem B]). The map $f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}$ has the required form and satisfies the first item; moreover, [55, Step 4 of the proof of Theorem B] shows that it is a homeomorphism onto its image. In particular, observe that, since $B \setminus l^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}$ is connected and $f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}|_{B\setminus l^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}}$ is a developing map, it follows that the sign of $\frac{\partial f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}^{(2)}}{\partial y}$ is constant on $B \setminus l^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}$, which ensures that $\operatorname{sgn}(f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}})$ is well-defined. Equation (18) also follows from the way in which existence of $f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}$ is shown (cf. [73, Step 4 of the proof of Theorem 3.8] for the case $\operatorname{sgn}(f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}) = +1$ and [35] for the general case). Equation (18), together with the definition of the integral affine structure on $B \setminus l^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}$, implies that $f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}(B)$ is a convex, rational, simple polygon (cf. [73, Step 6 of the proof of Theorem 3.8]). To complete the proof, observe that the above choice of developing map for the induced integral affine structure on $B \setminus l^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}$ is unique up to composition on the left by an element of $\mathcal{V}$ (cf. Corollary 5.23); since $B \setminus l^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} \subset B$ is dense, this shows that $f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}$ also satisfies the same property. □

**Remark 5.27.** It follows from the above proof that the only vertices of $f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}(B)$ that may fail to be smooth in the sense of Definition 5.17 are the ones which

belong to the image of vertical cuts. As a consequence, if a vertex $v$ of $f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}(B)$ is not smooth, then we can conclude that there is a focus-focus value whose first coordinate equals that of $v$. Equation (18) can be used to 'measure' the failure of any such vertex to be smooth (cf. [33, Lemma 2.28] for a precise statement). △

**Definition 5.28.** *Given a semi-toric system $(M, \omega, F)$ with $m_{\mathrm{ff}} > 0$ and any $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \in \{+1, -1\}^{m_{\mathrm{ff}}}$, a map $f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} : B \to \mathbb{R}^2$ as in Theorem 5.26 is said to be a* cartographic homeomorphism *of $(M, \omega, F)$ (relative to $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$) with* sign *given by $\operatorname{sgn}(f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}})$. Its image $\Delta_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} := f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}(B)$ is a* semi-toric polygon *associated to $(M, \omega, F)$ (relative to $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$).*

**Remark 5.29.** Any semi-toric polygon associated to a semi-toric system defined on a closed manifold can be used to recover the invariants of the underlying Hamiltonian $S^1$-space (cf. Remark 5.4 and [33]). The forthcoming [34] shows that, given a Hamiltonian $S^1$-space which satisfies some necessary conditions (called *thinness* in [34]), there exists a semi-toric system whose underlying Hamiltonian $S^1$-space is isomorphic to the original one. △

Our next aim is to encode information of a cartographic homeomorphism $f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}$ so as to generalize Definition 5.22. To this end, we first need to introduce an invariant of a cartographic homeomorphism (cf. [57, Section 5.2] for details) which relies on properties of the group $\mathcal{V}$.

### Twisting indices of a cartographic homeomorphism

Recall the group homomorphism $\operatorname{sgn} : \mathcal{V} \to \mathbb{Z}/2$ given by $\operatorname{sgn}(\rho) = \det(\operatorname{Lin}(\rho))$, where $\operatorname{Lin} : \mathrm{AGL}(2;\mathbb{Z}) \to \mathrm{GL}(2;\mathbb{Z})$ denotes the standard projection. Using the standard isomorphism $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{Z}) \cong \mathbb{Z}/2$, the homomorphism sgn makes $\mathbb{Z}$ into a $\mathcal{V}$-module, which is henceforth denoted by $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathrm{sgn}}$. On the other hand, if $\mathcal{V}^+ = \ker(\operatorname{sgn})$, there is a split short exact sequence

$$1 \longrightarrow \operatorname{Lin}(\mathcal{V}^+) \longrightarrow \operatorname{Lin}(\mathcal{V}) \xrightarrow{\det} \mathbb{Z}/2 \longrightarrow 1, \tag{19}$$

with splitting given by (upon choosing the standard basis for $\mathbb{R}^2$) $\mathfrak{s} : \zeta \mapsto \left(\left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \zeta \end{smallmatrix}\right), \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right)\right)$. The map $\left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ k & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right) \mapsto k$ defines an isomorphism $\operatorname{Lin}(\mathcal{V}^+) \cong \mathbb{Z}$, which is henceforth used tacitly. Consider the map

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa : \mathcal{V} &\to \operatorname{Lin}\left(\mathcal{V}^+\right) \cong \mathbb{Z} \\ h &\mapsto \operatorname{Lin}(h) \circ \mathfrak{s}\left(\operatorname{Lin}(h)\right)^{-1}; \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

this map fails to be a homomorphism precisely so that it becomes a *1-cocycle* for $\mathcal{V}$ with coefficients in $\mathbb{Z}_{\text{sgn}}$, *i.e.* for all $h, h' \in \mathcal{V}$, $\kappa(hh') = \kappa(h) + \text{sgn}(h)\kappa(h')$ (cf. [5, Chapter III]).

**Definition 5.30.** *The map $\kappa$ is called the* twisting cocycle *of $\mathcal{V}$.*

The twisting cocycle of $\mathcal{V}$ can be used to associate *twisting indices* to a cartographic homeomorphism as follows. Fix $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \in \{+1, -1\}^{m_{\text{ff}}}$. As in Section 5.2.1, for $i = 1, \ldots, m_{\text{ff}}$, let $V_i \subset \text{Int}(B)$ denote an open neighborhood of $c_i$ which contains precisely one singular value. For each $i = 1, \ldots, m_{\text{ff}}$, there is a unique (up to sign) Hamiltonian vector field $\mathcal{X}_i$ defined in $F^{-1}(V_i \smallsetminus l^{\epsilon_i})$ which is 'radial' (this is the vector field constructed in [57, Step 2 of Section 5.2]). In fact, there exists a map $\nu_{\epsilon_i} : V_i \to \mathbb{R}^2$ which is a cartographic homeomorphism relative to $\epsilon_i$ for the subsystem of $(M, \omega, F)$ relative to $F^{-1}(V_i)$, such that

- its sign is $+1$, and
- $\mathcal{X}_{\nu^{(2)}_{\epsilon_i}} = \mathcal{X}_i$, where $\nu_{\epsilon_i}(x, y) = \left(x, \nu^{(2)}_{\epsilon_i}(x, y)\right)$ (cf. [57, Lemma 5.6]).

**Definition 5.31.** *For each $i = 1, \ldots, m_{\text{ff}}$, the map $\nu_{\epsilon_i}$ is a* privileged *cartographic homeomorphism for $c_i$ relative to $\epsilon_i$. The collection $\boldsymbol{\nu}_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} := (\nu_{\epsilon_1}, \ldots, \nu_{\epsilon_{m_{\text{ff}}}})$ is a choice of* privileged *cartographic homeomorphisms for $(c_1, \ldots, c_{m_{\text{ff}}})$ relative to $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} = (\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_{m_{\text{ff}}})$.*

**Remark 5.32.** For given $i = 1, \ldots, m_{\text{ff}}$, $\epsilon_i$ and privileged cartographic homeomorphism $\nu_i$, $\nu_i'$ is a privileged cartographic homeomorphism for $c_i$ relative to $\epsilon_i$ if and only if there exists $\tau_i \in \mathcal{T}$ with $\nu'_{\epsilon_i} = \tau_i \circ \nu_{\epsilon_i}$, where $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{V}$ is the subgroup of vertical translations. △

Fix a cartographic homeomorphism $f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}$ and privileged cartographic homeomorphisms $\boldsymbol{\nu}_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}$. Since $f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}|_{V_i}$ and $\nu_{\epsilon_i}$ are cartographic homeomorphisms relative to $\epsilon_i$ for the subsystem of $(M, \omega, F)$ relative to $F^{-1}(V_i)$, there exists $\rho_i(f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}, \nu_{\epsilon_i}) \in \mathcal{V}$ such that $f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}|_{V_i} = \rho_i(f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}, \nu_{\epsilon_i}) \circ \nu_{\epsilon_i}$. (Observe that $\rho_i(f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}, \nu_{\epsilon_i})$ does not depend on the choice of neighborhood $V_i$.)

**Definition 5.33.** *The* twisting index *of the cartographic homeomorphism $f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}$ with respect to the privileged cartographic homeomorphisms $\boldsymbol{\nu}_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}$ is*

$$\boldsymbol{\kappa}(f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}, \boldsymbol{\nu}_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}) := \left(\kappa(\rho_1(f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}, \nu_{\epsilon_1})), \ldots, \kappa\left(\rho_{m_{\text{ff}}}\left(f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}, \nu_{\epsilon_{m_{\text{ff}}}}\right)\right)\right) \in \mathbb{Z}^{m_{\text{ff}}}.$$

In fact, the twisting index of any cartographic homeomorphism relative to $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ is independent of the choice of privileged cartographic homeomorphisms relative to $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$.

**Corollary 5.34.** *For $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \in \{+1,-1\}^{m_{\mathrm{ff}}}$, let $f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}$ be a cartographic homeomorphism and let $\boldsymbol{\nu}_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}, \boldsymbol{\nu}'_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}$ be privileged cartographic homeomorphisms relative to $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$. Then $\boldsymbol{\kappa}(f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}, \boldsymbol{\nu}_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}) = \boldsymbol{\kappa}(f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}, \boldsymbol{\nu}'_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}})$.*

*Proof.* It suffices to check that, for each $i = 1, \dots, m_{\mathrm{ff}}$, $\kappa(\rho_i(f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}, \nu_{\epsilon_i})) = \kappa\left(\rho_i\left(f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}, \nu'_{\epsilon_i}\right)\right)$. By Remark 5.32, there exists $\tau_i \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $\rho_i\left(f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}, \nu'_{\epsilon_i}\right) = \tau_i \circ \rho_i(f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}, \nu_{\epsilon_i})$. Then, using that $\kappa$ is a cocycle,

$$\kappa\left(\rho_i\left(f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}, \nu'_{\epsilon_i}\right)\right) = \kappa(\tau_i) + \operatorname{sgn}(\tau_i)\kappa\left(\rho_i\left(f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}, \nu_{\epsilon_i}\right)\right) = \kappa\left(\rho_i\left(f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}, \nu_{\epsilon_i}\right)\right),$$

since $\kappa|_{\mathcal{T}} \equiv 0$ and $\operatorname{sgn}|_{\mathcal{T}} \equiv 1$. □

In light of Corollary 5.34, the following notion makes sense.

**Definition 5.35.** *Given a cartographic homeomorphism $f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}$ relative to $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \in \{+1,-1\}^{m_{\mathrm{ff}}}$, the collection of* twisting indices *of $f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}$ is $\boldsymbol{\kappa}(f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}) := \boldsymbol{\kappa}(f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}, \boldsymbol{\nu}_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}})$, where $\nu_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}$ is any choice of privileged cartographic homeomorphisms relative to $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$.*

### Decorated semi-toric polygons and cartographic invariants in the case $m_{\mathrm{ff}} > 0$

With the twisting indices of a cartographic homeomorphism at hand, it is possible to define an invariant of a cartographic homeomorphism, which generalizes Definition 5.22.

**Definition 5.36.** *Given a semi-toric system $(M, \omega, F)$ with $m_{\mathrm{ff}} \geq 1$ and a cartographic homeomorphism $f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} : B \to \mathbb{R}^2$ relative to $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$, the* decorated semi-toric polygon associated to *$f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}$ is*

$$\left(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}, \operatorname{sgn}(f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}), f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}(B), \left(\left(\mathsf{c}_1, \kappa_1(f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}})\right), \dots, \left(\mathsf{c}_{m_{\mathrm{ff}}}, \kappa_{m_{\mathrm{ff}}}(f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}})\right)\right)\right)$$

*where $\operatorname{sgn}(f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}})$ is as in Definition 5.28, for each $i = 1, \dots, m_{\mathrm{ff}}$, $\mathsf{c}_i = f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}(c_i)$, and $\boldsymbol{\kappa}(f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}) = (\kappa_1(f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}), \dots, \kappa_{m_{\mathrm{ff}}}(f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}))$ is as in Definition 5.35.*

By Theorem 5.26, the decorated semi-toric polygon associated to a cartographic homeomorphism is an element of $\{+1,-1\}^{m_{\mathrm{ff}}} \times \{+1,-1\} \times \mathrm{RPol}\left(\mathbb{R}^2\right) \times \left(\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{Z}\right)^{m_{\mathrm{ff}}}$, and it should be clear how Definition 5.36 generalizes Definition 5.22.

To make the above notion of decorated semi-toric polygons into an invariant of the isomorphism class of $(M, \omega, F)$, the idea is to consider the possible decorated semi-toric polygons of *all* cartographic homeomorphisms

of *all* semi-toric systems isomorphic to $(M, \omega, F)$. To describe this family explicitly, we view a decorated semi-toric polygon as an element of

$$\{+1,-1\}^{m_{\mathrm{ff}}} \times \{+1,-1\} \times \mathrm{Pol}\left(\mathbb{R}^2\right) \times \left(\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{Z}\right)^{m_{\mathrm{ff}}},$$

and define a $\mathbb{Z}/2 \times \mathcal{V} \times \{+1,-1\}^{m_{\mathrm{ff}}}$ on this set as follows. First, we define a $\mathbb{Z}/2 \times \mathcal{V}$-action on $\{+1,-1\}^{m_{\mathrm{ff}}} \times \{+1,-1\} \times \mathrm{Pol}\left(\mathbb{R}^2\right) \times \left(\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{Z}\right)^{m_{\mathrm{ff}}}$ by setting

$$\begin{aligned}(\zeta, \rho) \cdot (\boldsymbol{\epsilon}, \eta, \Delta, &((\mathsf{c}_1, \kappa_1) \ldots, (\mathsf{c}_{m_{\mathrm{ff}}}, \kappa_{\mathrm{m_{ff}}})) := (\zeta\boldsymbol{\epsilon}, \zeta \mathrm{sgn}(h)\eta, \rho(\Delta), \\ &((\rho(\mathsf{c}_1), \kappa(\rho) + \mathrm{sgn}(\rho)\kappa_1), \ldots, (\rho(\mathsf{c}_{m_{\mathrm{ff}}}), \kappa(\rho) + \mathrm{sgn}(\rho)\kappa_{m_{\mathrm{ff}}}))),\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

for $(\zeta, \rho) \in \mathbb{Z}/2 \times \mathcal{V}$, $(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}, \eta, \Delta, ((\mathsf{c}_1, \kappa_1), \ldots, (\mathsf{c}_{m_{\mathrm{ff}}}, \kappa_{m_{\mathrm{ff}}}))) \in \{+1,-1\}^{m_{\mathrm{ff}}} \times \{+1,-1\} \times \mathrm{Pol}\left(\mathbb{R}^2\right) \times \left(\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{Z}\right)^{m_{\mathrm{ff}}}$ (cf. equation (17)). Second, we define a $\{+1,-1\}^{m_{\mathrm{ff}}}$-action which illustrates the fact that semi-toric polygons corresponding to different signs are related by *piece-wise* integral affine diffeomorphisms (cf. [73, Section 4] for details). For any $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, let $\mathsf{l}_{x_0} : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}^2$ be the piece-wise integral affine diffeomorphism which is the identity on $\{(x,y) \mid x \leq x_0\}$ and acts as the shear $\left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right)$ on $\{(x,y) \mid x > x_0\}$. Fix $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_N) \in \mathbb{R}^N$; for any $\mathbf{k} = (k_1, \ldots, k_N) \in \mathbb{Z}^N$, set $\mathsf{l}_{\mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{k}} := \mathsf{l}_{x_1}^{k_1} \circ \ldots \circ \mathsf{l}_{x_N}^{k_N}$. These transformations allow to state the following lemma, whose proof is left to the reader.

**Lemma 5.37.** *For any fixed integer $m_{\mathrm{ff}} \geq 1$, the formula*

$$\boldsymbol{\epsilon}' \star (\boldsymbol{\epsilon}, \eta, \Delta, ((\mathsf{c}_1, \kappa_1), \ldots, (\mathsf{c}_{m_{\mathrm{ff}}}, \kappa_{m_{\mathrm{ff}}}))) := \tag{22}$$

$$\left(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}' \bullet \boldsymbol{\epsilon}, \eta, \mathsf{l}_{\mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{k}(\eta, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}')}(\Delta), ((\mathsf{c}_1\kappa_1), \ldots, (\mathsf{c}_{m_{\mathrm{ff}}}, \kappa_{m_{\mathrm{ff}}}))\right), \tag{23}$$

*where $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}' \bullet \boldsymbol{\epsilon} := \left(\epsilon_1'\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_{m_{\mathrm{ff}}}'\epsilon_{m_{\mathrm{ff}}}\right)$, $\mathbf{k}(\eta, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}') := \eta\left(\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \bullet \frac{\mathbf{1}-\boldsymbol{\epsilon}'}{2}\right)$, and $\mathbf{x}$ is the obtained by taking the first components of $\mathsf{c}_1, \ldots, \mathsf{c}_{m_{\mathrm{ff}}}$, defines an action of $\{+1,-1\}^{m_{\mathrm{ff}}}$ on $\{+1,-1\}^{m_{\mathrm{ff}}} \times \{+1,-1\} \times \mathrm{Pol}\left(\mathbb{R}^2\right) \times \left(\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{Z}\right)^{m_{\mathrm{ff}}}$ which commutes with the $\mathbb{Z}/2 \times \mathcal{V}$-action given by equation (21).*

**Remark 5.38.** The above $\{+1,-1\}^{m_{\mathrm{ff}}}$-action does not leave $\{+1,-1\}^{m_{\mathrm{ff}}} \times \{+1,-1\} \times \mathrm{RPol}\left(\mathbb{R}^2\right) \times \left(\mathbb{R}^2\right)^{m_{\mathrm{ff}}}$ invariant, as not all elements of a given orbit are necessarily convex (cf. [58, Section 2.2]). On the other hand, the $\mathbb{Z}/2 \times \mathcal{V}$-action of equation (21) restricts to an action on $\{+1,-1\}^{m_{\mathrm{ff}}} \times \{+1,-1\} \times \mathrm{RPol}\left(\mathbb{R}^2\right) \times \left(\mathbb{R}^2\right)^{m_{\mathrm{ff}}}$. △

Lemma 5.37 yields an action of $\mathbb{Z}/2 \times \mathcal{V} \times \{+1,-1\}^{m_{\mathrm{ff}}}$ on $\{+1,-1\}^{m_{\mathrm{ff}}} \times \{+1,-1\} \times \mathrm{Pol}\left(\mathbb{R}^2\right) \times \left(\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{Z}\right)^{m_{\mathrm{ff}}}$, which can be used to introduce the following data attached to a semi-toric system (which is well-defined by [73, Proposition 4.1] and [57, Lemma 5.1 and Proposition 5.8]).

**Definition 5.39.** *Let $(M,\omega,F)$ be a semi-toric system with $m_{\mathrm{ff}} \geq 1$ focus-focus values. The* cartographic invariant *of $(M,\omega,F)$ is the $\mathbb{Z}/2 \times \mathcal{V} \times \{+1,-1\}^{m_{\mathrm{ff}}}$-orbit of the decorated semi-toric polygon associated to any cartographic homeomorphism.*

**Remark 5.40.** The cartographic invariant encodes three of the invariants of semi-toric systems as defined in [57], namely the *semi-toric polygon invariant*, the *volume invariant* and the *twisting index invariant* (cf. [57, Definition 4.5, Definition 5.2 and Definition 5.9]). Moreover, the slightly more general notion of isomorphism used in these notes enlarges the group acting, as the sign of a cartographic homeomorphism is allowed to be negative. △

The cartographic invariant of a semi-toric polygon is an invariant of its isomorphism class by [57, Lemmata 4.6, 5.3 and 5.10].

**Corollary 5.41.** *If two semi-toric systems are isomorphic, then they have equal cartographic invariants.*

## 5.3 Classification of semi-toric systems

Section 5.2 provides all invariants of semi-toric systems needed to determine their isomorphism type (cf. Theorem 5.43).

**Definition 5.42.** *Given a semi-toric system $(M,\omega,F=(J,H))$, its* complete set of invariants *is given by*

*(1) the number of focus-focus values;*

*(2) its Taylor series invariant (cf. Definition);*

*(3) its cartographic invariant (cf. Definition 5.39).*

The main result of [57], stated below without proof, shows that the invariants of Definition 5.42 completely determine a semi-toric system up to isomorphism (cf. [57, Theorem 6.2]).

**Theorem 5.43.** *Two semi-toric systems are isomorphic if and only if their complete sets of invariants are equal.*

To complete the classification of semi-toric systems, it suffices to determine which abstract data corresponds to the complete set of invariants of some semi-toric system. Without going into details, the possible cartographic invariants with twisting indices are restricted: for instance, the elements of $\left(\mathbb{R}^2\right)^{m_{\mathrm{ff}}}$ appearing in any such invariant lie in the interior of the corresponding polygon[9]. Moreover, the polygon *and* the elements of $\left(\mathbb{R}^2\right)^{m_{\mathrm{ff}}}$ are constrained (cf. [58, Section 4] for details). Being loose, we refer to any $\mathbb{Z}/2 \times \mathcal{V} \times \{+1,-1\}^{m_{\mathrm{ff}}}$- orbit in $\{+1,-1\}^{m_{\mathrm{ff}}} \times \{+1,-1\} \times \mathrm{Pol}\left(\mathbb{R}^2\right) \times \left(\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{Z}\right)^{m_{\mathrm{ff}}}$ which satisfies the necessary conditions of [58] as being *admissible*. Thus we can state the last result of this section, which completes the classification of semi-toric systems (cf. [58, Theorem 4.6]).

**Theorem 5.44.** *For any non-negative integer $m_{\mathrm{ff}}$, any element of $(\mathbb{R}[\![X,Y]\!]_0)^{m_{\mathrm{ff}}}$ and any admissible $\mathbb{Z}/2 \times \mathcal{V} \times \{+1,-1\}^{m_{\mathrm{ff}}}$- orbit in $\{+1,-1\}^{m_{\mathrm{ff}}} \times \{+1,-1\} \times \mathrm{Pol}\left(\mathbb{R}^2\right) \times \left(\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{Z}\right)^{m_{\mathrm{ff}}}$, there exists a semi-toric system whose complete set of invariants equals the above data.*

# 6 Quantum systems and the inverse problem

## 6.1 The joint spectrum

Recall from Definition 3.9 that a classical completely integrable system is the data of $n$ Poisson-commuting independent functions $f_1, \ldots, f_n$ on a $2n$-dimensional symplectic manifold. These functions are typically 'classical quantities', eg. energy, angular momentum, etc. In the quantum world, observables are linear operators acting on a Hilbert space, and usually bear the same name (quantum energy, quantum angular momentum, etc.). According to the correspondence principle, that we discuss below, the Poisson bracket is the classical limit of the operator bracket. This leads to the following general definition of a quantum integrable system.

**Definition 6.1.** *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a Hilbert space 'quantizing' the symplectic manifold $M^{2n}$. A quantum completely integrable system is a set of $n$ pairwise commuting, 'independent' selfadjoint operators $T_1, \ldots, T_n$ acting on $\mathcal{H}$:*

$$\forall i, j, \qquad [T_j, T_j] = 0. \tag{24}$$

In case the $T_j$ are not necessarily bounded, the commutation property (24) is taken in the strong sense: the spectral measure (obtained via the spectral theorem as a projector-valued measure) of $T_i$ and $T_j$ commute.

[9] This corresponds to the fact that the *volume invariants* of [57, 58] are necessarily positive.

We need, of course, to define the terms in quotation marks, see Section 6.2 below. Assuming this, we can introduce the most important object for us, which is the quantum analogue of the image of the moment map $F = (f_1, \ldots, f_n)$: namely the *joint spectrum* of $(T_1, \ldots, T_n)$.

Recall that the point spectrum of a (possibly unbounded) operator $T$ acting on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ is the set

$$\sigma_p(T) = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \quad | \quad \ker(T - \lambda I) \neq \{0\}.\}$$

An element of $\sigma_p$ is called an eigenvalue of $T$. More generally, the spectrum $\sigma(T)$ of $T$ is by definition the set of $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $(T - \lambda I)$ does not admit a bounded inverse; thus it contains $\sigma_p$. The spectrum of $T$ is called *discrete* when it consists of isolated eigenvalues of finite algebraic multiplicity.

**Definition 6.2.** *Let $(T_1, \ldots, T_n)$ be pairwise commuting operators; the* (discrete) Joint Spectrum *is the set of simultaneous eigenvalues,* ie.

$$\Sigma(T_1, \ldots, T_n) := \{(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n | \quad \bigcap_{j=1}^{n} \ker(T_j - \lambda_j I) \neq \{0\}\}.$$

A more general, not necessarily discrete, notion of joint spectrum can be obtained by considering the support of the joint spectral measure; see [7]. In this text we only consider the discrete case, which physically speaking corresponds to the existence of common localized quantum states for $T_1, \ldots, , T_n$.

Our goal is to relate $F(M)$ and $\Sigma(T_1, \ldots, T_n)$. Part of the question is hidden in the meaning of '$\mathcal{H}$ quantizing $M$', but not only. The operators $T_j$ themselves must possess a good semiclassical limit.

## 6.2 The correspondence principle and the semiclassical limit

What is the relation between the symplectic manifold $(M, \omega)$ and the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$? How can a quantum observable (an operator $T$) correspond to a classical observable (a function $f \in C^\infty(M)$)? The way to go from the classical setting to the quantum setting is called *quantization* by mathematicians; the other direction, which often makes more sense from the point of view of quantum mechanics, is called the *semiclassical limit*. It is out of the scope of this text to explain the various mathematical answers to these questions. We instead try to convey the general idea, and then propose a simple axiomatization that will be enough to prove some non-trivial results concerning the relationship between the joint spectrum and the image of the moment map.

The traditional, naive, approach to the correspondence bewteen classical and quantum mechanics is to consider polynomials in canonical (Darboux)

coordinates. Assume that, in some open set of $M$, $\omega = \sum_{j=1}^{n} d\xi_j \wedge dx_j$. Set $\xi = (\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ (momentum coordinates) and $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ (position coordinates). The corresponding 'quantizing' Hilbert space is the space $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ of square-integrable functions in the $x$ variable. The Dirac rule asserts on the one hand that the 'quantum position operator' associated with the variable $x_j$ is the operator of multiplication by $x_j$:

$$L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \ni u \mapsto x_j u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}). \tag{25}$$

Notice that this operator (that we simply denote by $x_j$) is unbounded, *i.e.* only defined on a dense subset of $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, which can be taken to be the set $C_0^\infty$ of compacty supported smooth functions, or the Schwartz space $\mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

On the other hand, the 'quantum momentum operator' associated with $\xi_j$ is the differentiation operator:

$$L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \ni u \mapsto \frac{\hbar}{i}\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_j} \in L^2(\mathbb{R}), \tag{26}$$

which is equally unbounded. While the Dirac rules are very natural, the difficulty arises as soon as one wants to quantize polynomials in $(x, \xi)$. Indeed, there is a choice to make, as position and momentum do not commute:

$$\left[\frac{\hbar}{i}\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}\,,\, x_j\right] = \frac{\hbar}{i}. \tag{27}$$

Hence both operators $\frac{\hbar}{i}\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \circ x_j$ and $x_j \circ \frac{\hbar}{i}\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}$ have the same classical limit $x_j\xi_j$. This property is called the *uncertainty principle* because it makes precise the fact that the operation of measuring the position and the momentum (or speed) of a quantum particle will yield different results depending on the order with which they are performed. This uncertainty vanishes in the *semiclassical limit* $\hbar \to 0$, and this simple observation goes a long way into building semiclassical theories where the knowledge of classical mechanics will give relevant information on the quantum spectrum, *provided* $\hbar$ is small enough.

In the mathematics literature, there are two widely used semiclassical theories:

1. Weyl quantization on $\mathbb{R}^n$, or more generally pseudo-differential quantization on $M = T^*X$, where $X$ is a smooth manifold of dimension $n$ (see [32] or [84]);

2. Berezin-Toeplitz quantization on a prequantizable compact Kähler manifold, or the more general version on symplectic manifolds, see [8] or [46].

In both cases, any smooth function on $M$ can be quantized to an operator on $\mathcal{H}$. However, in the case of Berezin-Toeplitz quantization, due to the compactness of $M$, the set of admissible values of $\hbar$ is quantized ($\hbar = 1/k$, with $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$) and the finite dimensional Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_\hbar$ must depend on $\hbar$.

## 6.3 The spherical pendulum and the spin-oscillator

### Spherical pendulum

Recall from Example 3.14 that the spherical pendulum is an integrable system on $TS^2 \simeq T^*S^2 \subset T^*\mathbb{R}^3$ given by the commuting functions

$$J(x,y) = x_1y_2 - x_2y_1; \quad H(x,y) = \frac{1}{2}\|y\|^2 + x_3.$$

It is a good exercise to show that the integrable system $(J,H)$ is *almost-toric* (see Section 4); see [43, Exercise 4] and [76].

The functions $H$ and $J$ can be viewed as restrictions to $T^*S^2$ of functions on $T^*\mathbb{R}^3$, and as such, can be quantized using (for instance) the Weyl quantization rule (see for instance [32, Section 9.6]), which in this case is a direct application of the correspondence principle (25), (26), yielding the following differential operators acting on functions of $(x_1, x_2, x_3)$:

$$\hat{J} = \frac{\hbar}{i}\left(x_1\frac{\partial}{\partial x_2} - x_2\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}\right); \quad \hat{H} = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2}\Delta + x_3,$$

where $\Delta = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial_{x_1}^2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial_{x_2}^2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial_{x_3}^2}$ is the Laplacian, and $x_3$ in the formula for $\hat{H}$ stands for $x_3\mathrm{Id}$, *i.e.* the operator of multiplication by $x_3$. It is a special property of Weyl's quantization that, since $H$ (or $J$) is a quadratic function, and $\{J,H\} = 0$, we get

$$[\hat{H}, \hat{J}] = 0$$

as a differential operator. Thus, this commutation property remains when we restrict these operators to functions on $S^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^3$. The corresponding restricted operators (which we continue to denote by $\hat{J}$ and $\hat{H}$) form a quantum integrable system in the sense of Definition 6.1, where the Hilbert space is the Lebesgue space $\mathcal{H} = L^2(S^2)$ (the sphere $S^2$ is equipped with the Euclidean density inherited from $\mathbb{R}^3$).

Since $S^2$ is a closed manifold, the spectral theory of $\hat{H}$ is relatively easy. Note that the restriction of $\Delta$ to smooth functions on $S^2$ is nothing by the Laplace-Beltrami operator on the Riemannian $S^2$. It is a general fact that the Laplace-Beltrami operator on a closed Riemannian manifold is essentially

selfadjoint (see for instance [70, Chapter 8]), and its closure is a selfadjoint operator with compact resolvent. Since $x_3$ is a bounded operator, the same conclusion continues to hold for $\hat{H}$. Thus, $\hat{H}$ has a discrete spectrum. For each eigenvalue $\lambda \in \sigma(\hat{H})$, the eigenspace $\ker(\hat{H} - \lambda)$ is finite dimensional and, by the ellipticity of $\hat{H}$, consists of smooth functions. Since $[\hat{J}, \hat{H}] = 0$, one can then restrict the angular momentum operator $\hat{J}$ to this eigenspace, which gives a Hermitian matrix, and compute its eigenvalues $\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_N$. The set of all such $(\mu_j, \lambda) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ constitute the joint spectrum of $(\hat{J}, \hat{H})$. A numerical approximation of it (with $\hbar = 0.1$) is depicted in Figure 2. A striking fact is that this joint spectrum perfectly fits within the image of the classical moment map $(J, H)$. That this is so, at least for small values of $\hbar$, can be proven in a very general setting, see Theorem 6.7.




Figure 2: Joint spectrum of the quantum spherical pendulum (black dots) for $\hbar = 0.1$. The circle indicates the position of the focus-focus critical value, and the red curve consists of all other critical values of the moment map $(J, H)$. Compare with Figure 1.

Starting from the seminal articles [17, 23], the spherical pendulum has been an inspiring toy-model for the understanding of the many links between classical and quantum integrable systems. The $J$-action is a global $S^1$ symmetry, however the spherical pendulum is not strictly speaking a semi-toric system (Definition 5.1), because the function $J$ is not proper. A quantum manifestation of this non-properness can be seen on Figure 2: for each fixed eigenvalue $\mu$ of $\hat{J}$, the corresponding eigenspace is infinite dimensional (and hence there is an infinite number of joint eigenvalues which project down onto $\mu$). Generalized semi-toric systems with non-proper $J$ can behave in many pathological ways, and their classification is still open, see [55].

**Spin-oscillator (or Jaynes-Cummings)**

It turns out that there is another simple integrable system whose local properties are essentially similar to the spherical pendulum, with the crucial difference that it is a genuine semi-toric system: the so-called spin-oscillator coupling [59], or, in the physics terminology, the Jaynes-Cummings system [37]. It is very similar to the coupled angular momenta of Example 3.15, but it enjoys the additional property, like the Spherical Pendulum does, to have a non-compact phase space.

Again, we let $S^2$ be the unit sphere in $\mathbb{R}^3$ with coordinates $(x_1, x_2, x_3)$, and let $\mathbb{R}^2$ be equipped with coordinates $(u, v)$. Let $M$ be the product manifold $S^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2$ equipped with the product symplectic structure $\omega_{S^2} \oplus \omega_0$, where $\omega_{S^2}$ is the standard symplectic form on the sphere and $\omega_0$ is the standard symplectic form on $\mathbb{R}^2$. Let $J, H \colon M \to \mathbb{R}$ be the smooth maps defined by

$$J := (u^2 + v^2)/2 + z \text{ and } H := \frac{1}{2}(ux + vy).$$

The *coupled spin-oscillator* is the 4-dimensional integrable system given by $(M, \omega_{S^2} \oplus \omega_0, (J, H))$. As for the Spherical Pendulum, the spin-oscillator is an almost-toric system, and it is in fact a semi-toric system (Definition 5.1). Its bifurcation diagram is very similar to that of the Spherical Pendulum: one isolated focus-focus critical value, and two branches of elliptic-regular values connected to each other at an elliptic-elliptic value.

However, from the quantum viewpoint, the Jaynes-Cummings model is very different the quantum spherical pendulum: because its phase space is not a cotangent bundle, it cannot be quantized using (pseudo)differential operators. Moreover, it contains a compact, invariant symplectic manifold $S^2 \times \{0\}$ , and hence can be quantized only for a discrete set of values of $\hbar \in (0, 1]$. There are two natural ways of obtaining commuting operators for this system. One is to view the sphere $S^2$ as a symplectic reduction of $\mathbb{C}^2$ and use invariant differential operators on $\mathbb{R}^2$, see [59]; another possibility is to perform Berezin-Toeplitz quantization of the $S^2$, see [54]. Figure 3 shows the joint spectrum of the Jaynes-Cummings model which, as was the case with the Spherical Pendulum, nicely fits within the image of the classical moment map.

## 6.4 Semiclassical quantization

Following [54], we shall not give the technical details of the Weyl or Berezin-Toeplitz quantization, but instead introduce a minimal set of simple axioms,




Figure 3: The joint spectrum of the Jaynes-Cummings model.

that are satisfied by these quantizations, and sufficient to understand how to obtain the semiclassical limit of a joint spectrum.

Let $M$ be a connected manifold (either closed or open). Let $\mathcal{A}_0$ be a subalgebra of $C^\infty(M;\mathbb{R})$ containing the constants and all compactly supported functions. We fix a subset $I \subset (0,1]$ that accumulates at 0. If $\mathcal{H}$ is a complex Hilbert space, we denote by $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ the set of linear (possibly unbounded) self-adjoint operators on $\mathcal{H}$. By a slight abuse of notation, we write $\|T\|$ for the *operator norm* of an operator, and $\|f\|$ for the *uniform norm* of a function on $M$.

**Definition 6.3.** *A* semiclassical quantization *of* $(M, \mathcal{A}_0)$ *consists of a family of complex Hilbert spaces* $\mathcal{H}_\hbar$, $\hbar \in I$, *and a family of* $\mathbb{R}$*-linear maps* $\mathrm{Op}_\hbar \colon \mathcal{A}_0 \to \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_\hbar)$ *satisfying the following properties, where* $f$ *and* $g$ *are in* $\mathcal{A}_0$*:*

1. $\|\mathrm{Op}_\hbar(1) - \mathrm{Id}\| = \mathcal{O}(\hbar)$ **(normalization)***;*
2. *for all* $f \geq 0$ *there exists a constant* $C_f$ *such that* $\mathrm{Op}_\hbar(f) \geq -C_f\hbar$ **(quasi-positivity)***; (this means* $\langle \mathrm{Op}_\hbar(f)u, u\rangle \geq -C\hbar\,\|u\|^2$ *for all* $u \in \mathcal{H}_\hbar$*)*
3. *let* $f \in \mathcal{A}_0$ *such that* $f \neq 0$ *and has compact support, then*

$$\liminf_{\hbar\to 0} \|\mathrm{Op}_\hbar(f)\| > 0$$

**(non-degeneracy)**;

4. *if $g$ has compact support, then for all $f$, $\mathrm{Op}_\hbar(f) \circ \mathrm{Op}_\hbar(g)$ is bounded, and we have*
$$\|\mathrm{Op}_\hbar(f) \circ \mathrm{Op}_\hbar(g) - \mathrm{Op}_\hbar(fg)\| = \mathcal{O}(\hbar),$$
**(product formula)**.

*A* quantizable *manifold is a manifold for which there exists a semiclassical quantization.*

We shall often use the following consequence of these axioms: for a bounded function $f$, the operator $\mathrm{Op}_\hbar(f)$ is bounded. Indeed, if $c_1 \leq f \leq c_2$ for some $c_1, c_2 \in \mathbb{R}$, normalization and quasi-positivity yield

$$c_1 \cdot \mathrm{Id} - \mathcal{O}(\hbar) \leq \mathrm{Op}_\hbar(f) \leq c_2 \cdot \mathrm{Id} + \mathcal{O}(\hbar). \tag{28}$$

Since our operators are selfadjoint, this is enough to obtain

$$\|\mathrm{Op}_\hbar(f)\| \leq \|f\| + \mathcal{O}(\hbar), \tag{29}$$

see Lemma 6.4 below:

**Lemma 6.4.** *Let $T$ be a (not necessarily bounded) selfadjoint operator on a Hilbert space with a dense domain and with spectrum $\sigma(T)$, we have*

$$\sup \sigma(T) = \sup_{u \neq 0} \frac{\langle Tu, u\rangle}{\langle u, u\rangle}\ . \tag{30}$$

*In particular,*

$$\sup\{|s| : s \in \sigma(T)\} = \sup_{u \neq 0} \frac{|\langle Tu, u\rangle|}{\langle u, u\rangle} = \|T\| \leq \infty;. \tag{31}$$

**Proof.** If $\lambda \in \sigma(T)$, then by the Weyl criterion, there exists a sequence $(u_n)$ with $\|u_n\| = 1$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \|(T - \lambda \mathrm{Id})u_n\| = 0.$$

Therefore, $\lim_{n\to\infty}\langle Tu_n, u_n\rangle = \lambda$, which implies that

$$\sup_{\|u\|=1} \langle Tu, u\rangle \geq \sup \sigma(T).$$

Conversely, if $\sigma(T)$ lies in $(-\infty, c]$, then by the spectral theorem $T \leq c \cdot \mathrm{Id}$ which yields

$$\sup_{\|u\|=1} \langle Tu, u\rangle \leq \sup \sigma(T).$$

□

### 6.5 Semiclassical operators

Consider the algebra $\mathcal{A}_I$ whose elements are collections $\vec{f} = (f_\hbar)_{\hbar\in I}$, $f_\hbar \in \mathcal{A}_0$ with the following property: for each $\vec{f}$ there exists $f_0 \in \mathcal{A}_0$ so that

$$f_\hbar = f_0 + \hbar f_{1,\hbar} \,, \tag{32}$$

where the sequence $f_{1,\hbar}$ is uniformly bounded in $\hbar$ and supported in the same compact set $K = K(\vec{f}) \subset M$. The function $f_0$ is called the *principal part* of $\vec{f}$. If $f_0$ is compactly supported as well, we say that $\vec{f}$ is *compactly supported*.

**Definition 6.5.** *We define a map*

$$Op : \mathcal{A}_I \to \prod_{\hbar\in I} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_\hbar), \quad \vec{f} = (f_\hbar) \mapsto (\mathrm{Op}_\hbar(f_\hbar)) \,.$$

*A semiclassical operator is an element in the image of Op. Given $\vec{f} \in \mathcal{A}_I$, the function $f_0 \in \mathcal{A}_0$ defined by (32) is called the principal symbol of $Op(\vec{f})$.*

By (29)

$$\mathrm{Op}_\hbar(f_\hbar) = \mathrm{Op}_\hbar(f_0) + \mathcal{O}(\hbar) \,. \tag{33}$$

This together with the product formula readily yields that for every $\vec{g}$ with compact support and every $\vec{f}$,

$$\|\mathrm{Op}_\hbar(f_\hbar) \circ \mathrm{Op}_\hbar(g_\hbar) - \mathrm{Op}_\hbar(f_\hbar g_\hbar)\| = \mathcal{O}(\hbar) \,. \tag{34}$$

Now we are ready to show that *the principal symbol of a semiclassical operator is unique*. Indeed, if $\mathrm{Op}(\vec{f}) = 0$, then for any compactly supported function $\chi$, we get by (34)

$$\mathrm{Op}_\hbar(f_\hbar\chi) = \mathrm{Op}_\hbar(f_\hbar)\mathrm{Op}_\hbar(\chi) + \mathcal{O}(\hbar) = \mathcal{O}(\hbar),$$

and then by (33), $\mathrm{Op}_\hbar(f_0\chi) = \mathcal{O}(\hbar)$. By the normalization axiom, we conclude that $f_0\chi = 0$. Since $\chi$ is arbitrary, $f_0 = 0$.

**Remark 6.6.** It is interesting to notice that this abstract semiclassical quantization do not use the uncertainty principle (27); and in fact, we don't even require $M$ to be symplectic! This, of course, is necessary for obtaining finer results, see [76]. △

## 6.6 Convergence of the joint spectrum for semiclassical integrable systems

Let $M$ be a quantizable manifold in the sense of Definition 6.3. Following definition 6.1, we can say that a semiclassical integrable system on $M$ is a set of independent commuting semiclassical operators $(T_1(\hbar), \dots, T_n(\hbar))$. Here, 'commuting' has to be understood for any fixed value of $\hbar$. Let $f_1, \dots, f_n$ be the principal symbols of $T_1(\hbar), \dots, T_n(\hbar)$, respectively. Then, by definition, the term 'independent' means that the differentials $df_1, \dots, df_n$ must be almost everywhere linearly independent, as in Definition 3.10.

Because we have not taken into account, in this weak version of quantization, the Poisson bracket and the uncertainty principle, we cannot relate the commutation $[T_i(\hbar), T_j(\hbar)] = 0$ to a classical property. In fact, in the very general theorem below, we don't even need the independence of $T_1(\hbar), \dots, T_n(\hbar)$. In any case, we may define the joint spectrum $\Sigma_\hbar(T_1, \dots, T_d)$, see Definition 6.2.

**Theorem 6.7** ([54])**.** *Let $M$ be a quantizable manifold. Let $d \geq 1$ and let $(T_1, \dots T_d)$ be pairwise commuting semiclassical operators on $M$. Let $F = (f_1, \dots, f_n) : M \to \mathbb{R}^n$, where $f_j$ is the principal symbol of $T_j$. Let $J$ be a subset of $I$ that accumulates at $0$. Then from the family*

$$\Big\{\Sigma_\hbar(T_1, \dots, T_d)\Big\}_{\hbar \in J}$$

*one can recover the closed convex hull of $F(M)$.*

The theorem is in fact constructive, in the sense that the convex hull of $\Sigma_\hbar(T_1, \dots, T_d)$ converges locally, in the Hausdorff sense, to $F(M)$; more precisely, we have:

**Theorem 6.8** ([54])**.** *Under the hypothesis of Theorem 6.7, if the operators $T_j$ are uniformly bounded as $\hbar \to 0$, then the closed convex hull of $\Sigma_\hbar(T_1, \dots, T_d)$ converges in the Hausdorff metric, as $\hbar \to 0$, to the closed convex hull of $F(M)$.*

*Proof.* We restrict here to the one-dimensional case ($n = 1$); the general case can be recovered by using linear combinations of the form $T_\xi := \sum \xi_j T_j$ (see [54]). If $n = 1$, the statement is quite easy to write down:

> «Prove that
>
> $$[\inf \sigma(T), \sup \sigma(T)] \to [\inf f, \sup f] \quad \text{as } \hbar \to 0,$$
>
> where $T$ is a bounded semiclassical operator, and $f$ its principal symbol.»

Let $\epsilon > 0$ be fixed, independent on $\hbar$. The easy part is to prove that, when $\hbar$ is small enough,

$$\sup \sigma(T) \leq \sup f + \epsilon,$$

as this is a direct consequence of (29), (30), and (31). Now let us show that, conversely,

$$\sup \sigma(T) \geq \sup f - 2\epsilon.$$

The strategy is to construct a good 'test function' $u$ that is close to realizing the sup in (30). Let $F_\epsilon := \sup f - \epsilon$; since $f$ is continuous, there exists a connected open set $B \subset M$ where $f \geq F_\epsilon$. Let $\chi \geq 0$ with $\chi \in C_0^\infty(B)$, *i.e.* $\chi$ is smooth function on $M$ with compact support $K \subset B$. Thus $(f - F_\epsilon)\chi \geq 0$ on $M$ and $(f - F_\epsilon)\chi = 0$ outside of $K$ (see Figure 4). Let $\tilde{\chi}$ be another cut-off function, with $\tilde{\chi} \geq 0$, $\tilde{\chi} = 1$ on a open set $\tilde{B}$ whose closure is contained in $B$, and $\tilde{\chi} \in C_0^\infty(K)$, so that $\tilde{\chi}\chi = \tilde{\chi}$, and hence, by the product formula,

$$\mathrm{Op}_\hbar \chi \circ \mathrm{Op}_\hbar \tilde{\chi} = \mathrm{Op}_\hbar \chi\tilde{\chi} + \mathcal{O}(\hbar) = \mathrm{Op}_\hbar \tilde{\chi} + \mathcal{O}(\hbar). \tag{35}$$




Figure 4: Construction of the 'quasimode' $w_\hbar$

The non-degeneracy axiom, together with Lemma 6.4, implies that one can find a vector $v_\hbar \in \mathcal{H}_\hbar$ such that

$$\|(\mathrm{Op}_\hbar \tilde{\chi})v_\hbar\| > c/2, \qquad c = \|\mathrm{Op}_\hbar \tilde{\chi}\|,$$

uniformly in $\hbar \leq 1$. Let

$$u_\hbar := \frac{(\mathrm{Op}_\hbar \tilde{\chi})v_\hbar}{\|(\mathrm{Op}_\hbar \tilde{\chi})v_\hbar\|};$$

then, using (35), we obtain

$$(\mathrm{Op}_\hbar \chi)u_\hbar = u_\hbar + \mathcal{O}(\hbar).$$

Finally, let $w_\hbar := (\mathrm{Op}_\hbar \chi)u_\hbar$; we have

$$\mathrm{Op}_\hbar(f - F_\epsilon)w_\hbar = \mathrm{Op}_\hbar((f - F_\epsilon)\chi)u_\hbar + \mathcal{O}(\hbar).$$

Hence, the quasi-positivity axiom implies

$$\langle \mathrm{Op}_\hbar(f - F_\epsilon)w_\hbar, u_\hbar\rangle \geq -C_\epsilon \hbar \left\|u_\hbar\right\|,$$

for some constant $C_\epsilon$ depending on $\epsilon$. Since $\|u_\hbar\| = 1$ and $\|w_\hbar\| = 1 + \mathcal{O}(\hbar)$, we get, for a possibly different constant $\tilde{C}_\epsilon$,

$$\langle \mathrm{Op}_\hbar(f - F_\epsilon)w_\hbar, w_\hbar\rangle \geq -\tilde{C}_\epsilon \hbar \left\|u_\hbar\right\|,$$

which implies, due to Lemma 6.4, that $\sup \sigma(T) \geq F_\epsilon - \tilde{C}_\epsilon \hbar$. Thus, when $\hbar$ is small enough, we can reach

$$\sup \sigma(T) \geq F_\epsilon - \epsilon,$$

as required. □

## 6.7 The inverse problem in the toric case

Theorem 6.7 has a rather spectacular consequence in the case of toric systems. Recall that an integrable system is called *toric* if the Hamiltonian flow of each function $f_1, \ldots, f_n$ is $2\pi$-periodic, and the corresponding $\mathbb{T}^n$-action is effective, see Example 3.16. Accordingly, a set of commuting semiclassical operators $T_1, \ldots, T_n$ will, by definition, constitute a *quantum toric system* if the principal symbols $f_1, \ldots, f_n$ form a toric system.

Such systems have been studied in details in [9] in the framework of Berezin-Toeplitz quantization. It was proven that the joint spectrum of such a system is a regular deformation (in the semiclassical parameter $\hbar$) of the set of $\hbar$-integral points of the image of the moment map $\mu := (f_1, \ldots, f_n)$; precisely:

$$\Sigma_\hbar(T_1, \ldots, T_n) = g_\hbar(\mu(M) \cap (v + \hbar\mathbb{Z}^n)) + \mathcal{O}(\hbar^\infty),$$

where $v$ is any vertex of the polytope $\mu(M)$, and $g_\hbar$ is a deformation of the identity:

$$g_h = \mathrm{Id} + \hbar g_1 + \hbar^2 g_2 + \cdots,$$

in the sense of an asymptotic expansion in the $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ topology.

As a consequence, the inverse problem was solved; in fact, this also follows directly from Theorem 6.7 for a general semiclassical quantization:

**Theorem 6.9** ([9, 54])**.** *In the class of quantum toric systems (on a compact symplectic manifold $M$), the asymptotics of the joint spectrum completely determines the symplectic manifold $M$ and the toric moment map $\mu$.*

*Proof.* The proof is a simple application of Theorem 6.7, in view of the Delzant classification [20]. Indeed, the asymptotics of the joint spectrum determine the closed convex hull of $\mu(M)$. But we know that in the class of toric systems, the image $\mu(M)$ is closed and convex. Thus, we may recover $\mu(M)$ from the joint spectrum. By the Delzant result, $\mu(M)$ in turn completely determines $(M, \mu)$. □

## 6.8 The general inverse problem

In view of Theorem 6.9 above, it is tempting to state a general conjecture, as follows.

**Conjecture 6.10.** *Let $\mathscr{ND}_n$ be the class of completely integrable systems on a $2n$ symplectic manifold with non-degenerate singularities (see Definition 4.7). Let $Q(\mathscr{ND}_n)$ be the class of $n$-uples $T = (T_1, \dots, T_n)$ of commuting operators whose principal symbols form an element in $\mathscr{ND}_n$. Then the asymptotics of the joint spectrum of an element in $T \in Q(\mathscr{ND}_n)$ completely determines the symplectic manifold and the principal symbols of $T$.*

A the time of writing, this conjecture is widely open. However, preliminary results can shed some light. In one degree of freedom, the conjecture was shown to hold in a generic (and large) subset of $\mathscr{ND}_1$ [77]. Genericity was necessary because of possible symmetries that generate eigenvalues with multiplicities. Hence, for a general statement, it should be clear that 'joint spectrum' is understood as a spectrum with multiplicities.

Theorem 6.9 states that the conjecture holds when $\mathscr{ND}$ is replaced by the set of toric systems. Recently, several papers have been trying to attack the semi-toric case, see [61, 44] and references therein. In [44], the authors prove the following result:

**Theorem 6.11** ([44])**.** *For quantum semi-toric systems which are either semiclassical pseudo-differential operators, or semiclassical Berezin-Toeplitz operators, the joint spectrum (modulo $\mathcal{O}(\hbar^2)$) determines the following invariants:*

(1) *the number $m_f$ of focus-focus values,*

(2) *the Taylor series associated with each focus-focus value (see Definition 5.10 and Theorem 4.36),*

(3) *the volume invariant associated with each focus-focus value,*

(4) *the polygonal invariant of the system.*

The last two ingredients are part of what we describe in this work as the *cartographic invariant*, see Section 5.2.2. In order to obtain a full answer in the semi-toric case, it remains on the one hand to be able to detect the full cartographic invariant (which means detecting the twisting cocycle), and on the other hand to recover exactly the principal symbols, not only up to isomorphism (in other words, if two systems have the same joint spectrum, can we prove that the map $g$ in Definition 5.7 is the identity?).

In comparison to semi-toric systems, more general integrable systems in $\mathscr{NSD}_n$ become quickly much more delicate to analyze, due to the presence of *hyperbolic singularities*, which allow for non-connected fibers of the moment map. It is currently not known how to obtain a tractable classification of integrable systems with hyperbolic singularities; however a solid topological foundation was laid out in the book [4]. A reasonable approach would be to first consider the case of hyperbolic singularities in the presence of a global $S^1$-action.

Finally, we conclude with two open questions closely related to the conjecture.

1. Can one detect from the joint spectrum of a system in $Q(\mathscr{NSD}_n)$ whether the system is semi-toric?

2. Can one tell from the joint spectrum of a general quantum integrable system whether it belongs to $Q(\mathscr{NSD}_n)$?

## References


[1] M. F. Atiyah. Convexity and commuting Hamiltonians. *Bull. London Math. Soc.*, 14(1):1–15, 1982.

[2] L. Auslander and L. Markus. Holonomy of flat affinely connected manifolds. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 62:139–151, 1955.

[3] L. M. Bates and J. Śniatycki. On action-angle variables. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 120(4):337–343, 1992.

[4] A. V. Bolsinov and A. T. Fomenko. *Integrable Hamiltonian systems; Geometry, topology, classification*. Chapman & Hall, 2004. Translated from the 1999 Russian original.

[5] K. S. Brown. *Cohomology of groups*, volume 87 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1982.

[6] M. Chaperon. Normalisation of the smooth focus-focus: a simple proof. *Acta Math. Vietnam.*, 38(1):3–9, 2013.

[7] A.-M. Charbonnel. Comportement semi-classique du spectre conjoint d'opérateurs pseudo-différentiels qui commutent. *Asymptotic Analysis*, 1:227–261, 1988.

[8] L. Charles. Berezin-toeplitz operators, a semi-classical approach. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 239(1-2):1–28, 2003.

[9] L. Charles, Á. Pelayo, and S. Vũ Ngọc. Isospectrality for quantum toric integrable systems. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup.*, 43:815–849, 2013.

[10] M. S. Child. Quantum states in a Champagne bottle. *J.Phys.A.*, 31:657–670, 1998.

[11] M. S. Child, T. Weston, and J. Tennyson. Quantum monodromy in the spectrum of $H_2O$ and other systems: new insight into the level structure of quasi-linear molecules. *Mol. Phys.*, 96(3):371–379, 1999.

[12] Y. Colin de Verdière and S. Vũ Ngọc. Singular Bohr-Sommerfeld rules for 2D integrable systems. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4)*, 36(1):1–55, 2003.

[13] Y. Colin de Verdière and J. Vey. Le lemme de Morse isochore. *Topology*, 18(4):283–293, 1979.

[14] M. Crainic, R. Loja Fernandes, and D. Martínez-Torres. Regular poisson manifolds of compact types (PMCT2). *arXiv:1603.00064*, 2016.

[15] M. Crainic, R. Loja Fernandes, and D. Martínez-Torres. Poisson manifolds of compact types (PMCT1). *to appear in Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik (Crelle)*, 2017.

[16] F. W. Cummings. Stimulated emission of radiation in a single mode. *Phys. Rev.*, 140(4A):A1051–A1056, 1965.

[17] R. Cushman and J. J. Duistermaat. The quantum spherical pendulum. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)*, 19:475–479, 1988.

[18] R. Cushman, H. Dullin, A. Giacobbe, D. Holm, M. Joyeux, P. Lynch, D. Sadovskii, and B. Zhilinskii. The $CO2$ molecule as a quantum realization of the $1:1:2$ resonant swing-spring with monodromy. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 93(24302), 2004.

[19] P. Dazord and T. Delzant. Le problème général des variables actions-angles. *J. Differential Geom.*, 26(2):223–251, 1987.

[20] T. Delzant. Hamiltoniens périodiques et images convexes de l'application moment. *Bull. Soc. Math. France*, 116(3):315–339, 1988.

[21] J.-P. Dufour and P. Molino. Compactification d'actions de $\mathbf{R}^n$ et variables action-angle avec singularités. In *Symplectic geometry, groupoids, and integrable systems (Berkeley, CA, 1989)*, volume 20 of *Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ.*, pages 151–167. Springer, New York, 1991.

[22] J. J. Duistermaat. On global action-angle coordinates. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 33(6):687–706, 1980.

[23] J. J. Duistermaat. On global action-angle variables. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 33:687–706, 1980.

[24] J. J. Duistermaat and G. J. Heckman. On the variation in the cohomology of the symplectic form of the reduced phase space. *Invent. Math.*, 69(2):259–268, 1982.

[25] L. H. Eliasson. *Hamiltonian systems with Poisson commuting integrals.* PhD thesis, University of Stockholm, 1984.

[26] L. H. Eliasson. Normal forms for Hamiltonian systems with Poisson commuting integrals—elliptic case. *Comment. Math. Helv.*, 65(1):4–35, 1990.

[27] R. L. Fernandes, C. Laurent-Gengoux, and P. Vanhaecke. Global action-angle variables for non-commutative integrable systems. *to appear in J. Symp. Geom.*, 2015.

[28] V. Guillemin, E. Lerman, and S. Sternberg. On the Kostant multiplicity formula. *J. Geom. Phys.*, 5(4):721–750 (1989), 1988.

[29] V. Guillemin and S. Sternberg. Convexity properties of the moment mapping. *Invent. Math.*, 67(3):491–513, 1982.

[30] V. Guillemin and S. Sternberg. A normal form for the moment map. In *Differential geometric methods in mathematical physics (Jerusalem, 1982)*, volume 6 of *Math. Phys. Stud.*, pages 161–175. Reidel, Dordrecht, 1984.

[31] V. Guillemin and S. Sternberg. *Symplectic techniques in physics.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, second edition, 1990.

[32] V. Guillemin and S. Sternberg. *Semi-classical analysis*. International Press, Boston, MA, 2013.

[33] S. Hohloch, S. Sabatini, and D. Sepe. From compact semi-toric systems to Hamiltonian $S^1$-spaces. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 35(1):247–281, 2015.

[34] S. Hohloch, S. Sabatini, D. Sepe, and M. Symington. From Hamiltonian $S^1$-spaces to compact semi-toric systems via surgeries. *In preparation*, 2017.

[35] S. Hohloch, S. Sabatini, D. Sepe, and M. Symington. Vertical almost-toric systems. *In preparation*, 2017.

[36] C. Huygens. *Horologium Oscillatorium sive de motu pendulorum*. Muguet, Paris, 1673.

[37] E. T. Jaynes and F. W. Cummings. Comparison of quantum and semi-classical radiation theories with application to the beam maser. *Proc. IEEE*, 51(1):89–109, 1963.

[38] B. Jovanović. Noncommutative integrability and action-angle variables in contact geometry. *J. Symplectic Geom.*, 10(4):535–561, 2012.

[39] M. Joyeux. Gustavson's procedure and the dynamics of highly excited vibrational states. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 109:2111–2122, 1998.

[40] Y. Karshon. Periodic Hamiltonian flows on four-dimensional manifolds. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 141(672):viii+71, 1999.

[41] Y. Karshon and E. Lerman. Non-compact symplectic toric manifolds. *SIGMA Symmetry Integrability Geom. Methods Appl.*, 11:Paper 055, 37, 2015.

[42] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz. *Quantum mechanics: non-relativistic theory. Course of Theoretical Physics, Vol. 3*. Addison-Wesley Series in Advanced Physics. Pergamon Press Ltd., London-Paris; for U.S.A. and Canada: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc., Reading, Mass;, 1958. Translated from the Russian by J. B. Sykes and J. S. Bell.

[43] Y. Le Floch, J. Palmer, D. Sepe, and S. Vũ Ngọc. Integrable systems, symmetries, and quantization – exercises with solutions. Poisson 2016 Summer School, available at http://blogperso.univ-rennes1.fr/san.vu-ngoc/, 2016.

[44] Y. Le Floch, Á. Pelayo, and S. Vũ Ngọc. Inverse spectral theory for semiclassical Jaynes-Cummings systems. *Math. Ann.*, 364(3):1393—-1413, 2016.

[45] E. Lerman, E. Meinrenken, S. Tolman, and C. Woodward. Nonabelian convexity by symplectic cuts. *Topology*, 37(2):245–259, 1998.

[46] X. Ma and G. Marinescu. *Holomorphic Morse inequalities and Bergman kernels*, volume 254 of *Progress in Mathematics*. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2007.

[47] D. McDuff and D. Salamon. *Introduction to symplectic topology*. Oxford Mathematical Monographs. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, second edition, 1998.

[48] E. Miranda. *On symplectic linearization of singular Lagrangian foliations*. PhD thesis, University of Barcelona, 2003.

[49] E. Miranda and S. Vũ Ngọc. A singular Poincaré lemma. *Int. Math. Res. Not.*, 1:27–45, 2005.

[50] E. Miranda and N. T. Zung. Equivariant normal form for nondegenerate singular orbits of integrable Hamiltonian systems. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4)*, 37(6):819–839, 2004.

[51] I. Moerdijk and J. Mrčun. *Introduction to foliations and Lie groupoids*, volume 91 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003.

[52] J. Mrčun. An extension of the Reeb stability theorem. *Topology Appl.*, 70(1):25–55, 1996.

[53] R. S. Palais. The symmetries of solitons. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)*, 34(4):339–403, 1997.

[54] Á. Pelayo, L. Polterovich, and S. Vũ Ngọc. Semiclassical quantization and spectral limits of $\hbar$-pseudodifferential and Berezin-Toeplitz operators. *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3)*, 109(3):676–696, 2014.

[55] Á. Pelayo, T. S. Ratiu, and S. Vũ Ngọc. The affine invariant of generalized semitoric systems. *arXiv:1307.7516*, 2013.

[56] Á. Pelayo and X. Tang. Mutiple focus-focus. in preparation.

[57] Á. Pelayo and S. Vũ Ngọc. Semitoric integrable systems on symplectic 4-manifolds. *Invent. Math.*, 177(3):571–597, 2009.

[58] Á. Pelayo and S. Vũ Ngọc. Constructing integrable systems of semitoric type. *Acta Math.*, 206(1):93–125, 2011.

[59] Á. Pelayo and S. Vũ Ngọc. Hamiltonian dynamics and spectral theory for spin-oscillators. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 309(1):123–154, 2012.

[60] Á. Pelayo and S. Vũ Ngọc. Private communication, 2017.

[61] Á. Pelayo and S. Vũ Ngọc. First steps in symplectic and spectral theory of integrable systems. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 32(10):3325–3377, 2012.

[62] H. Rüssmann. Über das Verhalten analytischer Hamiltonscher Differentialgleichungen in der Nähe einer Gleichgewichtslösung. *Math. Ann.*, 154:285–300, 1964.

[63] D. A. Sadovskiĭ and B. I. Zhĥilinskiĭ. Monodromy, diabolic points, and angular momentum coupling. *Phys. Lett. A*, 256(4):235–244, 1999.

[64] M. A. Salazar and D. Sepe. Contact isotropic realisations of Jacobi manifolds via Spencer operators. *arXiv:1406.2138v2*, 2016.

[65] N. Sansonetto and D. Sepe. Twisted isotropic realisations of twisted Poisson structures. *J. Geom. Mech.*, 5(2):233–256, 2013.

[66] J. Smillie. An obstruction to the existence of affine structures. *Invent. Math.*, 64(3):411–415, 1981.

[67] G. Smirnov. Focus-focus singularities in classical mechanics. *Nelin. Dinam.*, 10(1):101–112, 2014.

[68] I. Stewart. Quantizing the classical cat. *Nature*, 430:731–732, 2004.

[69] M. Symington. Four dimensions from two in symplectic topology. In *Topology and geometry of manifolds (Athens, GA, 2001)*, volume 71 of *Proc. Sympos. Pure Math.*, pages 153–208. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2003.

[70] M. E. Taylor. *Partial differential equations II. Qualitative studies of linear equations*, volume 116 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer, New York, second edition, 2011.

[71] S. Vũ Ngọc. Bohr-Sommerfeld conditions for integrable systems with critical manifolds of focus-focus type. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 53(2):143–217, 2000.

[72] S. Vũ Ngọc. On semi-global invariants for focus-focus singularities. *Topology*, 42(2):365–380, 2003.

[73] S. Vũ Ngọc. Moment polytopes for symplectic manifolds with monodromy. *Adv. Math.*, 208(2):909–934, 2007.

[74] S. Vũ Ngọc and C. Wacheux. Smooth normal forms for integrable Hamiltonian systems near a focus-focus singularity. *Acta Math. Vietnam.*, 38(1):107–122, 2013.

[75] J. Vey. Sur certains systèmes dynamiques séparables. *Amer. J. Math.*, 100(3):591–614, 1978.

[76] S. Vũ Ngọc. *Systèmes intégrables semi-classiques: du local au global*. Number 22 in Panoramas et Syhthèses. SMF, 2006.

[77] S. Vũ Ngọc. Symplectic inverse spectral theory for pseudodifferential operators. In *Geometric aspects of analysis and mechanics*, volume 292 of *Progr. Math.*, pages 353–372. Birkhäuser/Springer, New York, 2011.

[78] A. Weinstein. The local structure of Poisson manifolds. *J. Differential Geom.*, 18(3):523–557, 1983.

[79] J. Williamson. On the Algebraic Problem Concerning the Normal Forms of Linear Dynamical Systems. *Amer. J. Math.*, 58(1):141–163, 1936.

[80] N. T. Zung. Symplectic topology of integrable Hamiltonian systems. I. Arnold-Liouville with singularities. *Compositio Math.*, 101(2):179–215, 1996.

[81] N. T. Zung. A note on focus-focus singularities. *Differential Geom. Appl.*, 7(2):123–130, 1997.

[82] N. T. Zung. Another note on focus-focus singularities. *Lett. Math. Phys.*, 60(1):87–99, 2002.

[83] N. T. Zung. Proper groupoids and momentum maps: linearization, affinity, and convexity. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4)*, 39(5):841–869, 2006.

[84] M. Zworski. *Semiclassical analysis*, volume 138 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2012.